```
I9CAAPOL1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                              17 CR 649 (GBD)
                 V.
      TERRELL POLK,
5
6
                    Defendant.
 7
           ----x
 8
                                              New York, N.Y.
                                              September 12, 2018
9
                                              9:45 a.m.
10
     Before:
11
                          HON. GEORGE B. DANIELS,
12
                                              District Judge
                                               - and a Jury -
13
14
                                APPEARANCES
15
      GEOFFREY S. BERMAN,
           United States Attorney for the
16
           Southern District of New York
17
     MICHAEL KIM KROUSE
     NICHOLAS FOLLY
18
     MAX NICHOLAS
          Assistant United States Attorneys
19
     RICHARD B. LIND
20
          Attorney for Defendant
21
     ALSO PRESENT:
22
      JONATHAN CONCEPCION, U.S. Attorney's Office Paralegal
23
     JESSICA ALVARADO, NYPD
24
25
```

```
1
               (Trial resumed; Jury not present)
 2
               THE COURT: Good morning.
 3
               All our jurors are here. Is there anything you need
 4
      to address?
 5
               MR. LIND: I think there's some issue from the
6
      government -- playing the post-arrest statement portions of it.
 7
      Not the whole thing and --
8
               THE COURT: What is the issue?
9
               MR. LIND: I don't know. Must be an issue with the
10
      government.
11
               MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, it's not proper cross to just
     play portions of Mr. Williams' post-arrest statement which is
12
13
     my understanding of what Mr. Lind intents to do.
14
     Mr. Williams -- just for the Court's background -- Mr. Williams
15
      when he was arrested in November of 2016 gave a post-arrest
      statement that was recorded. The government's provided that
16
17
      recording to Mr. Lind. There's also a 302 report of that
18
      post-arrest statement which was also provided.
19
               The government is fine with Mr. Lind asking
20
     Mr. Williams questions and then if those answers are
21
      inconsistent with his post-arrest statement, asking him or
22
      confronting him with it and saying, Didn't you say during your
23
     post-arrest statement, "X" and then see what Mr. Williams says
24
     but he can't just get up and play the recording of
25
     Mr. Williams's post-arrest statement? It's hearsay.
                                                            It's not
```

proper cross-examination. It's not evidence that confident for the defense to admit. So he can certainly confront

Mr. Williams for any inconsistencies between what he says now and what he said in his post-arrest but he can't just get up and play the recording.

THE COURT: What did you want to do?

MR. LIND: I wanted to play portions of it where for one thing the agent, I guess the detective was there. She is talking about how long they have been looking for him. And I think that that's important in order to show that the indictment that he was charged with in 2016, the investigation for that goes back at least a year, maybe a year and a half during the same period that he claims that he was involved with my client who is not charged in the 2016 indictment.

THE COURT: I'll sorry. I am confused. I am not sure what the 2016 indictment you are referring to.

MR. LIND: He was indicted. He mentioned it on the stand. He got charged with about 20 other people for selling drugs, firearms, and I don't know if your Honor remembers this at the end of the day --

THE COURT: Well, was he arrested with any of these individuals?

MR. LIND: No, he wasn't.

THE COURT: What does that have to do with your client?

MR. LIND: What it has to do with my client is that during the same period that they are investigating this -- and also if he denies various allegations in the indictment he gets up, he denies that he was shooting at this guy Lasin in the park.

MR. KROUSE: He testified that on direct, your Honor. He testified about shooting --

MR. LIND: Then there can't be any problem.

THE COURT: Stop. Stop. One at a time. I am just trying to hear factually from you — are you trying to impeach him with a prior inconsistent statement? It's inconsistent with what he testified to on direct or else what are you trying to do?

MR. LIND: Well, it's not inconsistent necessarily with what he said on direct. For example, did the detective tell him during that course of that interview that they have been investigating him and these other people for a year, year and a half.

THE COURT: What other people?

MR. LIND: The other people in that indictment.

THE COURT: But that's not your client or any of the people that he put on this board, right?

MR. LIND: Not necessarily, judge. But what I'm saying is he is eventually indicted.

THE COURT: Right. And he's done a lot of illegal

things. So he is indicted for one of the illegal things he did.

MR. LIND: For three illegal things. But it's in the exact same neighborhood as Mr. Polk was supposed to be allegedly in the same exact neighborhood. And they didn't indict Mr. Polk. And what I'm saying is, that's what he was doing in 2014 and 2015.

THE COURT: With Mr. Polk?

MR. LIND: No. With others.

THE COURT: OK. What does that have to do with Mr. Polk?

MR. LIND: It shows that he was in fact working with this other group. We was working with Mr. Polk.

MR. KROUSE: Mr. Polk was in prison during that period, your Honor.

MR. LIND: No, he wasn't.

THE COURT: Slow down. Mr. Lind, what is it that you want to ask this witness and how do you want to pose it?

MR. LIND: Let me get my notes, judge.

THE COURT: OK. I just want to know in your questioning of this witness how you want to utilize these statements. If he said something previously on direct or at some other time and you're claiming that there's a prior inconsistent statement, that's one thing.

If you are just trying to get a fact out of him, then

the question is do you ask him that fact before you start playing prior statements? If he denies the fact, then you can play the statement and confront him with it. If he admits the fact, then I'm not sure what the purpose is of playing some recording. I'm not sure what is on the recording yet.

MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, I think that's right as far as it goes on the impeachment of prior inconsistent statements as long as those facts are relevant in any way to this trial. So if Mr. Lind is trying to elicit from this witness what the detectives told him, which is hearsay, about what they were or were not doing in the neighborhood during this period and who they were investigating and whether or not Mr. Polk was indicted on the Flybridge indictment or whether or not Mr. Williams committed crimes and other people in addition to Mr. Polk. It's confusing to the jury.

It's not relevant to this case. It's completely improper cross to try to elicit through this witness what the NYPD officers or the FBI was investigating in this neighborhood. I think he can get out that Mr. Williams was indicted with other people and that's why he was arrested in November of 2016 and he can certainly challenge certain statements he made during post-arrest statements that were inconsistent with what he is saying today. But he can't try to get in these hearsay statements that detectives made to him and then he certainly can't just then play these recordings in open

22

23

24

25

court with no proper purpose when the easiest way and the 1 proper way to do it is to ask a question and if the answer is 2 3 inconsistent with a previous statement, then say didn't you on 4 this date say this which is different. And then if he says 5 "yes, I said that" then that's the end of that inquiry. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Lind, do you have some sort of 7 transcript. 8 MR. LIND: On the recording, no, judge. 9 THE COURT: So let's start with this. What is it that 10 you want to play? What part of the conversation? 11 MR. LIND: Well, what I want to play is the part where 12 he says that he --13 He was not involved in robberies? THE COURT: 14 MR. LIND: Yes. That's part of it. I forget what was brought out on direct. Was that brought out? 15 THE COURT: He obviously said -- he did say -- well, I 16 17 think he did say he was involved in robberies. Did he? MR. LIND: No, he didn't. 18 19 THE COURT: On the stand? 20

MR. KROUSE: He made one statement about when somebody owed him a drug that he went to their friend's house and pulled a gun and took their phones and money. I think he might not view that as a robbery because he was going to just hold that and then when he was paid he would give it back.

THE COURT: Does his plea agreement reference

robberies? 1 2 MR. KROUSE: No, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Does it say he is getting coverage for the 4 robberies? 5 Judge? MR. LIND: 6 MR. KROUSE: And mr. Lind is certainly free to ask 7 him, did you commit robberies as well? And if he says "no" and he had previously said yes or whatever, he can challenge. We 8 9 just want to go in the proper order. 10 THE COURT: I understand, your argument. I am just 11 trying to get the facts. 12 Mr. Lind, what do you want to play? 13 MR. LIND: For example, he'll say he said during the 14 interview that he was a hustler, selling drugs but he wasn't a 15 stick-up guy. OK? 16 THE COURT: OK. 17 MR. LIND: Now, that wasn't true. And I don't think 18 that was elicited by the government. 19 THE COURT: And how extensive is the tape recording 20 you want to play? 21 MR. LIND: There are many. 22 THE COURT: How many portions? 23 MR. LIND: There was a -- I would say it's a couple 24 minutes all together. It's hard to tell, judge, because I put

down when this particular statement ends. I don't have when it

1	ends.
2	THE COURT: How many different statements do you want
3	to play?
4	MR. LIND: The government itself has admitted that he
5	lied at the interview.
6	THE COURT: I'm ignorant here. You've got to give me
7	some more information.
8	MR. LIND: About the stick-up guy that he didn't do
9	the park robbery. I don't think that was brought up on
10	cross-examination on direct-examination.
11	THE COURT: Are all the portions that you want to play
12	inconsistent with what he testified to yesterday?
13	MR. LIND: No.
14	THE COURT: OK. So what portion
15	MR. LIND: Are they inconsistent? He now admits that
16	he was a stick-up guy, that he committed robberies.
17	THE COURT: What did he say on the tape?
18	MR. LIND: On the tape he said he didn't commit
19	THE COURT: That is inconsistent with what he
20	testified to.
21	MR. LIND: What he told them.
22	THE COURT: All right. So are the portions that you
23	want to play, are they inconsistent with the testimony he gave

MR. LIND: Yes.

24

25

yesterday?

1	THE COURT: OK.
2	MR. LIND: Judge, if you want to I can go over these
3	right now.
4	THE COURT: I just want a feel for it so I know what
5	I'm ruling on. Give me one example of what you want to play.
6	What's the first thing you want to play and ask him about?
7	MR. LIND: That he was never a stick-up guy.
8	THE COURT: On the tape he makes the comment "I was
9	never a stick-up guy".
10	MR. LIND: Yes.
11	THE COURT: And you want to say to them that that was
12	false?
13	MR. LIND: Right. That was a false statement, OK,
14	that he wasn't involved in this robbery. I guess in Nelson
15	Park; is that right? The shooting in Nelson Park.
16	MR. KROUSE: He testified that he committed that
17	shooting, your Honor, on direct. So, that's not inconsistent.
18	THE COURT: One at a time.
19	Mr. Lind, what is it
20	MR. LIND: I am asking him about the stuff that he
21	said back then.
22	THE COURT: Is it inconsistent with what he said
23	MR. LIND: On the stand
24	THE COURT: Yes.
25	MR. LIND: That part not inconsistent.

1 THE COURT: So, what point are you trying to make by 2 playing that portion? 3 That he wasn't a stick-up quy. MR. LIND: 4 THE COURT: When? Yesterday or on the tape? 5 MR. LIND: On the tape that. 6 THE COURT: He said he wasn't a stick-up guy and you 7 want to play that and say that that was false? 8 MR. LIND: Right. 9 THE COURT: OK. And what else is the subject matter? 10 MR. LIND: Trying to look here, judge. I'm sorry. 11 THE COURT: I'm trying to figure out how extensive 12 this is. 13 MR. LIND: No, sir, it's not going to be very 14 extensive. 15 THE COURT: And what the subject matter is? MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, if I may just draw the 16 17 distinction of what we're objecting to. We're certainly not 18 objecting to Mr. Lind challenging the witness with prior statements that he made in a post-arrest interview and saying 19 20 that those statements he made in that interview are 21 inconsistent with what he is saying now. There's just a way to 22 do that and it doesn't involve playing the video. 23 THE COURT: It doesn't preclude him from playing the 24 If it's on the video and it's a prior inconsistent video. 25 statement, he can play it for the witness and ask the witness

1 | did he make that statement.

MR. KROUSE: But he can ask that question without the video.

THE COURT: Right. But he can ask the question with the video. There is nothing to prevent him from saying we have a video of you saying something different. Let me play the video for you. When you said that, was that true?

MR. KROUSE: The video is not evidence, your Honor.

THE COURT: No, it's not evidence. The question and the answer is evidence.

MR. KROUSE: The answer is evidence.

THE COURT: But the jury is entitled to know what it is he said.

MR. KROUSE: I agree with that completely, your Honor.

And I believe that Mr. Lind can say, Mr. Williams, "Are you a stick-up artist"? And he can say "No, I'm not" or something like that. Then he can say didn't you in a previous statement say that you --

THE COURT: I understand he can do that if he wants to do that but my final question is usually this. You've got to have two things to object. You've got to have a ground to object and a reason to object.

What's your reason for objecting? Why don't you want this played?

MR. KROUSE: The video is not evidence, your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Why don't you want the jury to hear the evidence? 2 3 MR. KROUSE: Because the video is not in evidence. 4 THE COURT: That's not a reason to --5 MR. KROUSE: It can't be published. 6 THE COURT: If the video was a confession you wouldn't 7 have a reason not to the play the video. Why do you not 8 want --9 MR. KROUSE: If it was a confession by this witness I 10 would have a reason because it's hearsay, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: That's your ground. That's not your 12 What's your good reason that you don't want the jury 13 to hear it? 14 MR. KROUSE: There is a couple reasons, your Honor. The video is not in evidence so it's being published to the 15 jury even though it's not admitted evidence? 16 17 THE COURT: How does that hurt you? What is the 18 reason you don't want that? MR. KROUSE: Because it could confuse the jury about 19 20 the reason why the video is being played. Depending on how it 21 comes out, Mr. Lind can ask the question, you gave a previous 22 post-arrest statement, correct? And he will say "yes" to that. 23 Mr. Lind can ask him a question that somehow touches on what 24 was said in that post-arrest statement. 25 THE COURT: I know all of that. But the fact is if

this had been a transcript it wouldn't be the same. If he read from the transcript and said, didn't you give a deposition and weren't you asked this question and didn't you give this answer? It doesn't make the transcript evidence. It's a question. If he plays the video, if it was a video deposition he could do that. If it's a video statement that he made and it's inconsistent with what he said at trial, the jury is entitled to see what he said, how he said it and whether or not they believed he was telling the truth then or now.

MR. KROUSE: But if Mr. Lind says in the post-arrest statement didn't you say you weren't a stick-up guy and then Mr. Williams says, yes, I said that in my post-arrest statement, then there is no inconsistencies, then why play the video that's not in evidence?

THE COURT: Again, why not? Why are we fighting about this?

MR. KROUSE: Because the witness in that scenario would have just admitted that he said that. So it's cumulative to then play the video where he then didn't say that.

THE COURT: I understand.

Mr. Lind, play the video. Let's go and move forward.

Ask your question and let's move.

MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, Mr. Lind from our understanding doesn't have the ability able to play the video so he is relying on the government to do that.

MR. KROUSE: We will assist him but if he could

provide us with some timestamps, something that could --

THE COURT: You are assisting him?

MR. LIND: Timestamp on the video?

MR. KROUSE: Exactly.

THE COURT: I just want us to efficiently move this. We have the jury here on time and we're 20 minutes late.

(Pause)

MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, it would have been helpful to the government to know that Mr. Lind was going to do this before this morning.

THE COURT: That's a keen perception of the obvious. What else do you want to say?

MR. KROUSE: Then we could have viewed what portions he was playing.

THE COURT: What do you want me to do, agree with you?

MR. KROUSE: We want to be able to have an opportunity
to look at what he wants to play to see if we have any other
objections. For instance, if we understand the Court's ruling
to be that Mr. Lind can confront the witness himself with
statements he made. But it sounds to me that Mr. Lind also
wants to play other hearsay statements made by detectives such
as, we were looking for you for a long time. That's plainly
inadmissible and has nothing to do with the witness. It may
not even be true. It might be something detectives are just

saying to butter up the defendant.

Mr. Lind wants to use. So our suggestion, your Honor, in the interest of keeping moving efficiently with the jury is to have Mr. Lind do other portions of his cross-examination with the witness this morning, take the morning break depending on how long it is going to be and then during the break have Mr. Lind show us what he intends to confront the witness with because right now we're just flying blind and have no idea what's going to be played.

THE COURT: I only half agree with you. It was your responsibility to find that out before you made the objection, if you have any objection. I am not particularly empathetic with that position.

Mr. Lind, I'm going to let you do it the way you want to do it. How do you want to do it?

MR. LIND: I'd like to move forward, judge. I think it'll take five minutes.

THE COURT: You'll get five minutes but you are not getting any more than that.

MR. LIND: We have get this set up, judge.

THE COURT: You have five monies. Otherwise, you'll have to go without.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Let me bring in the jury.

1 (Jury present) 2 THE COURT: You could be seated, ladies and gentlemen. 3 Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I apologize for 4 the delay but we have been having a little bit of a technical 5 difficulty with the equipment here and we were resolving some issues that don't concern you. Let me assure you that usually 6 7 in the long run it saves us time resolving these issues before you come out rather than delaying the trial. 8 9 Right now I believe that we are still on schedule to 10 finish the witnesses by no the later than tomorrow. So if we 11 do that I am going to anticipate hopefully having summations and closing arguments of the parties, instructing you on the 12 13 law and sending you in to begin deliberations on Friday. So 14 that's my plan at this point. Again, I want to keep us on 15 schedule or maybe even try to move that up a little bit. 16 So we're now cross-examination, Mr. Lind? 17 MR. LIND: Thank you. 18 Good morning, Mr. Williams. 19 CICERO WILLIAMS, 20 called as a witness by the Government, 21 having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 22 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LIND: 23

Q. Mr. Williams, yesterday during your testimony you knew every question that was going to be asked of you, correct?

24

25

- 1 A. Say that again.
- 2 Q. Yesterday before during your testimony, you knew every
- 3 question the government was going to ask of you, correct?
- 4 | A. No.
- 5 | Q. What questions did you not know before?
- A. I can't really say offhand but it was the questions he was
- 7 asking me, so I just answered them truthfully.
- 8 | Q. But you had gone over that numerous times with the
- 9 prosecutor before you testified, correct?
- 10 A. We went over a couple of things but like I said, most of
- 11 | times they asked questions for other things.
- 12 | Q. I don't know what you mean by that?
- 13 A. Other situations about the proffer and what I got to be
- 14 | truthful of.
- 15 | Q. When you say "proffer" what do you mean by "proffer"?
- 16 | A. Assisting the government with the things that, the crimes I
- 17 | had committed.
- 18 | Q. How many hours did you spend going over your testimony with
- 19 the government before you testified yesterday?
- 20 A. A lot of hours.
- 21 | Q. 20/30, hours?
- 22 A. Maybe.
- 23 Q. Maybe more?
- 24 A. Maybe.
- 25 Q. Now at none of those sessions was there an attorney

- 1 present, right?
- 2 | A. No, sir.
- 3 Q. Unlike when you met the government during the first times
- 4 you met with them, your attorney was present then, correct?
- $5 \parallel A. \text{ Yes, sir.}$
- 6 Q. And each time the government went over stuff during the
- 7 proffer sessions, your attorney was there, correct, and
- 8 | protected your rights, right?
- 9 A. He was there a couple of times. Then after that he wasn't
- 10 there.
- 11 | Q. Isn't it a fact that you're under the government's complete
- 12 control in determining what to say here, correct?
- 13 A. I can't say that. Under complete control is just me
- 14 | cooperating and giving them assistance, the true things I was
- 15 doing out there in the streets.
- 16 | Q. And you have to testify truthfully according to the
- 17 government otherwise your deal is ripped up, correct?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 | Q. And what you have to testify to is what you went over with
- 20 | the government; isn't that correct?
- 21 A. About what I had told them.
- 22 | Q. But they came up with the questions, right? And you know
- 23 what the questions are and you know what the answers should be,
- 24 | correct?
- 25 A. It shouldn't be hard because what I told them was the truth

- and that's the questions that they asked me. So I just answered truthfully.
- 3 | Q. Now, you have had a long criminal history, correct?
- 4 | A. Yes, I do.
- 5 | Q. We went over part of that yesterday; do you remember that?
- 6 | A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Now, the government asked you, were you ever arrested for
- 8 those charges. Do you remember going over the charges with the
- 9 government yesterday?
- 10 A. Yes, I do.
- 11 | Q. What were the charges that you were arrested for; do you
- 12 remember testifying about that?
- 13 A. Selling crack cocaine, possession of handguns, shootings
- 14 and tampering with a witness.
- 15 | Q. I am not talking about your present charges. I am talking
- 16 about the ones where you brought it up to the government,
- 17 otherwise, they would have never known about that. Do you
- 18 remember going over those yesterday?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. That has nothing to do with intimidating a witness,
- 21 correct? That wasn't in the indictment. That wasn't something
- 22 | that you brought up to them?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. You had charges in 1996, 1997 -- I forget the years but
- 25 they were like 20/25 years ago. Do you remember those charges?

- 1 A. Yeah. It was a long time ago.
- Q. And you were never arrested or convicted or prosecuted under any of those charges, correct?
 - A. No.

- Q. And the reason why you've disclosed it to the government is
- 6 because the government told you you'd better tell us everything
- 7 because otherwise you are going to become worthless as a
- 8 | witness. Somebody's going to bring that up, find out about it
- 9 and you are going to be exposed as a liar, correct?
- 10 A. Not in that way. They told me just to tell the truth,
- 11 everything what happened in my life. So for me admitting it
- 12 and want to get through with this part of my life and the
- 13 | situation of my life, so I just told to them everything that I
- 14 knew and everything that I did.
- MR. LIND: One moment, judge?
- 16 THE COURT: Yes.
- 17 (Pause)
- 18 Q. In 1996 you were charged with firing at other people. Do
- 19 you remember that, firing at another person? Do you remember
- 20 | testifying about that yesterday?
- 21 A. I never had got arrested for that 1996.
- 22 | Q. You weren't arrested for that but that's what you did,
- 23 || right?
- 24 A. Yes, I admitted to that.
- 25 | Q. And did you do that to hurt the person?

- 1 A. Yes. They was trying to hurt me truthfully.
- 2 Q. My question is, did you try to hurt the person back?
- 3 A. Yes, because he was trying to hurt me.
- 4 | Q. That's not my question. Can you answer my question please?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. OK. And that's why you shot him, right?
- 7 A. Shot at him.
- 8 Q. And there was another shooting in 2002, correct?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. Now, the 1996 shooting occurred in Mount Vernon; do you
- 11 remember testifying about that?
- 12 | A. Yes, I did.
- 13 | Q. You were living in Mount Vernon, correct?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. And you had been living in Mount Vernon for a number of
- 16 | years before 1996, correct, about three our four years?
- 17 A. No, not before all that happened.
- 18 | Q. Well, how many years before 1996 were you living in Mount
- 19 Vernon?
- 20 | A. I was living in Mount Vernon I was back -- that was back in
- 21 | 1994 I was back and forth from the Bronx to Mount Vernon but I
- 22 | was still living in the projects in High bridge.
- 23 Q. You were also living in Mount Vernon, correct?
- 24 A. Yes. My mother had a house in Mount Vernon.
- 25 | Q. That's where you were living, right?

- 1 | A. I was living in Highbridge but I was back and forth.
- 2 | Q. What portion of your time were you spending in Mount
- 3 Vernon?
- 4 A. Whenever I wanted to come up there when I was going to
- 5 school cause I was in school up there but basically, I was just
- 6 I was playing a lot of hooky and being very rebellious to my
- 7 | mother and just doing what I want every since I was like 15
- 8 years old, 14/15 years old.
- 9 Q. Now, you went into drug dealing when you were 14/15 years
- 10 | old?
- 11 A. You could say when I was about 16.
- 12 | Q. And that was up in Mount Vernon?
- 13 A. No. In the Bronx.
- 14 | Q. But this shooting occurred in Mount Vernon, correct?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. Why were you up there then?
- 17 A. As I said, I was going to school and I know a couple of
- 18 | friends that I met up there and I started hanging out with them
- 19 | as well. So I was, it was just a back and forth thing that I
- 20 was doing.
- 21 | Q. In fact, most of the time you were living in Mount Vernon;
- 22 | isn't that correct?
- 23 | A. I can't say that. It was like most of my best friends was
- 24 | in the Bronx. My childhood friends was in the Bronx. So, I
- 25 was really in the Bronx a lot but when I come up to Mount

- 1 Vernon I be up there a couple of weeks, you know.
- 2 | Q. Didn't you tell the jury yesterday that you only lived in
- 3 | the projects? You didn't mention Mount Vernon at all, did you?
- 4 A. I did only live -- I really did only --
- 5 Q. You mentioned Mount Vernon yesterday?
- 6 A. No, I didn't mention Mount Vernon yesterday.
- 7 \mathbb{Q} . Why not?
- 8 | A. Because like I just said, it was all of my childhood
- 9 | friends is from the Bronx. So most of my time was in the
- 10 | Bronx. I stopped going to school in Mount Vernon and just
- 11 | completely just dropped out because all my friends was in the
- 12 | Bronx. Yeah, I met some friends in Mount Vernon and I got into
- 13 | that situation, the shooting up there and after that I just
- 14 | completely cut Mount Vernon off.
- 15 | Q. You didn't go to Mount Vernon after 1996; is that what you
- 16 | are telling us?
- 17 A. Yeah. I went up there to see my mother and hang with my
- 18 other family that live up there.
- 19 | Q. For a significant period of time you would go up there,
- 20 || right?
- 21 A. Yes, I would go up there.
- 22 | Q. Then there was another shooting in 2002, correct?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. And that's with a guy named Chris; you shot a guy named
- 25 | Chris?

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. And it was your territory. Where did that shooting occur
- 3 | in the Bronx?
- 4 A. In the Bronx, yes.
- 5 | Q. There were three or four shots fired?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. And did you shoot those shots?
- 8 A. Yes, I did.
- 9 Q. Why were you trying to kill Chris?
- 10 A. He was shooting at me.
- 11 | Q. That's not my question. My question is, were you trying to
- 12 | kill Chris?
- 13 A. If somebody -- I was shooting cause I was trying to protect
- 14 | myself. But on the other hand, that it was five other people
- 15 | out there shooting, you know so.
- 16 | Q. Were you trying to kill Chris by shooting at him, yes or
- 17 no?
- 18 | A. I was protecting myself, yes, I was --
- 19 Q. It's a simple question, Mr. Williams. Were you trying to
- 20 | kill him?
- 21 A. I was trying to get him -- yeah, you could say that.
- 22 | Q. And no, can you say that that's the question? Were you
- 23 | trying to kill him?
- 24 A. I was trying to just let him know that I'm protected too,
- 25 you know.

- Q. Now, then there was another shooting that occurred in 2007;
- 2 do you remember that?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. What happened then?
- 5 A. Me and this gentleman that I knew for a long time, we had a
- 6 | fight, a fistfight and the next day I approached him. He shot
- 7 | me in my arm. In my shoulder, I mean. And when I got better
- 8 and I got out the hospital. I saw him and I shot him, sir.
- 9 Q. You were looking to kill him, right?
- 10 A. I was looking to harm him because he harmed me.
- 11 | Q. You were looking to kill him, right; yes or no?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. And then in 2009 there was another shooting, correct, that
- 14 | you were involved in?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 \parallel Q. And what was the person that you shot who was involved in
- 17 | the shooting?
- 18 A. I think we were just talking about that same shooting.
- 19 Q. That's the same one?
- 20 | A. Yeah.
- 21 | Q. Wasn't there a shooting in 2009, as well?
- 22 A. Yes. That was on the concourse.
- 23 Q. Now, were you trying to kill the person that you shot at
- 24 | that day?
- 25 A. On what year?

- 1 | Q. 2009.
- 2 A. I didn't shoot nobody in 2009. That was the other
- 3 shooting.
- 4 | Q. Then in the summer of 2015 you pistol whipped someone --
- 5 I'm sorry. Let me back up.
- In the winter of 2013 you went to get a gun and you
- 7 | shot an individual; is that correct?
- 8 A. 2000 and what?
 - Q. 2013, winter of 2013.
- 10 | A. Yes.

9

- 11 | Q. And you shot someone?
- 12 | A. Yes, sir.
- 13 | Q. And you were looking to kill that person, right?
- 14 A. I wasn't wanting to kill him but when I shot at them. It
- 15 was a lot of them. And at the time the guy had hit my friend
- 16 mother with a cake in her face. And at that time I was angry
- 17 | and I was mad. Any time you shoot a gun, sometimes you don't
- 18 mean to try to kill a person but bullets, they ain't got no
- 19 | name. Once it goes out the chamber any like, it could hit you
- 20 | any kind of way and anybody could wrongful get hurt and die.
- 21 | Q. So let me see if I understand something. Someone threw a
- 22 | cake at your mother?
- 23 A. At my friend's mother.
- 24 | Q. Your friend's mother?
- 25 A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

24

25

- 1 And to retaliate against a cake you decided to shoot and kill someone is that your testimony? 2
 - A. At the time when I approached the gentleman, it was a lot of them you know.
 - Q. But let's talk about the guy that you shot at, not talk about everyone.
 - A. Because I'm talking about the guy that I shot at because he was with the gentleman that when I approached him I felt like my life is in danger. I only brung the gun because it was a lot of them and I felt like my life was in danger. Once they surround me, so I pulled out and I shot one of them.
 - Now, then in summer of 2015 you pistol-whipped someone. Do you remember testifying about that?
- 14 Yes. Α.
 - Q. And who was the person that you pistol-whipped?
- It was a kid, a gentleman that, from my hood from my block 16 17 in Highbridge that I thought he was -- we had a argument about him talking to my girlfriend. And that situation escalated, me 18
- 19 hitting him with my gun.
- 20 Q. And tell us what it means to pistol whip. You take a 21 pistol and you beat someone over the face with it?
- 22 Basically, I took my gun and I hit him in the face with it.
- 23 Which end? The forward end or the handle? What did you
- hit him with?
 - The side of the gun. Α.

- Q. And how many times did you hit him in the face with the side of the gun?
- 3 A. Like twice, three times.
- 4 | Q. And was unconscious after you did this?
- 5 A. He was on the floor but he wasn't unconscious or anything.
- 6 Q. Was he bleeding?
- $7 \parallel A. \text{ Yes, sir.}$
- 8 | Q. And the reason you pistol whipped him was what?
- 9 A. Because we had an argument about my girl and him trying to get with my girl and about a girlfriend thing.
- 11 Q. So it was about a girlfriend thing and he had not fired at
- 12 | you, right?
- 13 | A. No, sir.
- 14 | Q. He had not pistol whipped you, right?
- 15 | A. No, sir.
- 16 Q. So in order to resolve this argument about your girlfriend
- 17 | you decided to pistol whip him, correct?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 | Q. Is that the first time you ever pistol-whipped someone?
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 | Q. Is that the last time?
- 22 | A. Yes, sir.
- 23 | Q. Now, apart from these cases that you supposedly brought to
- 24 | the government's attention, you had a number of convictions,
- 25 | correct?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. You had a conviction in 1995 for robbery right?
- 3 A. Yes, when I was young.
- 4 Q. OK. So you were about 15 years old?
- $5 \parallel A. \text{ Yes, sir.}$
- 6 Q. When did that robbery take place?
- 7 A. In the Bronx, sir.
- 8 | Q. You got 20 months in detention for that, correct?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 | Q. And then in November of 2007 you were arrested for criminal
- 11 possession of marijuana, assault on a police officer; do you
- 12 | recall that?
- 13 | A. No, sir.
- 14 Q. Do you remember pleading guilty to resisting arrest?
- 15 | A. You said in the '97?
- 16 Q. Not '97. 2007.
- 17 A. Yes, I remember that, sir.
- 18 Q. Now that your memory is refreshed; do you recall that?
- 19 A. Yes, I do. I thought you said "'97", that's why.
- 20 | Q. Maybe I did. I meant 2007.
- 21 A. I remember me getting arrested.
- 22 | Q. You were convicted of that, right?
- 23 A. Yes, I pled guilty to that.
- 24 | Q. So unlike these cases where the government asked you about
- 25 | yesterday, they didn't ask you about this one in the '95

- robbery. They didn't ask you about this arrest and conviction
 in November 2007, right?
- A. It was so long, long time ago that I had forgot about it so.
- 5 Q. Now, in 2003 you pled guilty to criminal possession of a controlled substance?
- 7 A. 2003.
- 8 Q. Yes.
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And in 2006 you pled guilty to criminal possession of a
- 11 controlled substance again with intent to sell; do you recall
- 12 | that?
- 13 A. 2006? I really don't know that one right there.
- 14 | Q. You don't recall that one?
- 15 A. Yes, I don't.
- 16 Q. Now, in 2013 you were convicted of criminal facilitation;
- 17 do you recall that?
- 18 | A. In 2013?
- 19 Q. Yes.
- 20 | A. Yes, I do.
- 21 | Q. How much time did you get for that; do you recall?
- 22 A. I didn't get no time.
- 23 | Q. All these convictions are in state court, correct?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. Now, in October of 2016 you pled guilty to criminal

- 1 possession of a controlled substance again; do you recall that?
- 2 | A. In 2016?
- 3 Q. Yes.
- 4 A. Controlled substance? For my violation?
- 5 | Q. No. It's separate -- are you talking about violation of
- 6 | supervised release?
- 7 | A. Yes, "2016" you said?
- 8 Q. You were no longer on supervised release in October of
- 9 | 2016, were you? I think this is state case?
- 10 A. Yeah. I was not on probation or nothing like that in 2016.
- 11 | You said when, in October?
- 12 | Q. Yes.
- 13 A. 2016 October the feds had issued a warrant out for me.
- 14 Q. OK. I am talking about a state case. You were still on
- 15 | the street in October of 2016, correct?
- 16 A. October 2015.
- 17 | Q. Sixteen?
- 18 A. Sixteen? Yes. I was on the run. They had issued a
- 19 warrant out for me on October the 5th of 2016.
- 20 Q. Now, these are the state charges and then the government
- 21 | went into yesterday, you were charged with a number of federal
- 22 | charges; do you recall that?
- 23 A. Yes, I was charged with some federal charges.
- 24 | Q. And the first one is in 2011 and 2012 you were charged with
- 25 distributing initially charged with distributing crack and

- 1 possessing a firearm; do you remember that?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And possessing a firearm is a consecutive sentence to the,
- 4 | would be a consecutive sentence to the drug charge, right?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Five years, right?
- 7 A. When I had came to the feds my lawyer, I think he got it
- 8 | thrown, that gun charge thrown out and I pled to the crack
- 9 | cocaine.
- 10 | Q. All right. Your attorney got it changed to an information,
- 11 | correct?
- 12 | A. A what?
- 13 | Q. An information? Which is a different type of charge. Do
- 14 you remember you pled guilty to an information in 2017. That's
- 15 | something that doesn't have to go to a grand jury do you
- 16 remember that?
- 17 A. When I pled guilty too what in 2017? I was locked up in
- 18 | 2017.
- 19 Q. I'll get to that in a minute. I'll get to your most recent
- 20 charge. Do you remember going over with Mr. Krouse your most
- 21 recent charges that you pled guilty to?
- 22 | A. For the indictment?
- 23 | O. For the indictment?
- 24 A. Yes.

25

Q. It's not an indictment though. It is an information, OK.

- 1 | I'm not trying to confuse you but it's an information rather
- 2 | than an indictment, correct?
- 3 A. That's what you said.
- 4 | Q. OK. Now you pled guilty to that and you faced zero to 20
- 5 years. Do you remember who you pled guilty in front of?
- 6 A. What year I pled guilty to?
- 7 | Q. I think it was 2012?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. In this courthouse?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Do you remember who you pled guilty in front of?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 \mathbb{Q} . Who was it?
- 14 A. It was Judge Daniels.
- 15 \parallel Q. OK. And you were facing a number of years and he gave you
- 16 | two years, right?
- 17 | A. Yes, sir.
- 18 | Q. Which is a very reasonable sentence, correct?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 | Q. Given your criminal background, right?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. And in fact, you got out a few months after you were
- 23 | sentenced?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. And you were placed on supervised release, right?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. And supervised release is like state parole, state
- 3 probation, right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. You just -- you were supposed to obey the law, comply with
- 6 | the law, correct?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. But you didn't, right?
- 9 A. No, sir.
- 10 | Q. And one of the provisions on your judgment of sentencing
- 11 was a provision that stated that you should not possess a
- 12 | firearm, correct?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. You knew that, right?
- 15 | A. Yes, sir.
- 16 | Q. And you violated that how many times?
- 17 A. A lot of times.
- 18 | Q. Ten, 20, 50?
- 19 | A. A lot.
- 20 Q. So it meant nothing to you, right?
- 21 A. It did mean something to me.
- 22 | Q. Then why didn't you obey it?
- 23 | A. I wasn't in a right state of mind and as well as me going
- 24 back to the streets and trying to get money to feed my family
- 25 and then trying to cope with the pressure that I got in my life

- and I just basically just stopped listening and went back to
 the streets to sell drugs. I didn't have no job. I was trying
 to get one and I really just got tired of it and fell back into
 the same habit that got me in jail in the first place.
 - Q. Well, doesn't supervised release don't they provide for you to have an outlet to deal with your drug problem?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Did you ever attend any of those sessions that they have for you?
- 10 | A. Yes.

6

7

8

9

- 11 Q. OK. But you stopped attending them, right?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And what was the reason that you stopped attending them?
- 14 A. Like I said, it was I got desperate and I lost hope of a
- 15 | lot of things that was going on in my life and the first thing
- 16 | I did was start smoking marijuana and got back into the
- 17 | negativity that was -- it's no easy to get back into when
- 18 | you're living in the part of -- that I live in and when you
- 19 come outside, that's all you see, people selling drugs and
- 20 people holding guns and a lot of negative, just a lot of
- 21 | negative activity that is going on. So I admit falling a
- 22 | victim and falling back into the same thing that got me here in
- 23 | the first place. I ain't --
- 24 | Q. Well, you started selling drugs again, right?
- 25 A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Even though you knew that it was a violation of the terms of your supervised release right?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And you started selling drugs because you wanted to make money for your family; is that right?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. You wanted to make money for yourself, right?
 - A. I wanted to provide and I was just thinking about all the material things and thinking about what I don't got and I just got caught up. It's like I ain't mean to how to say this it's like when I got sentenced and the judge let me go. I did get up and tell the judge that I would not do it again. That wasn't I was with that. I admit to that that that was my angle not to get back in trouble. I swear that was my angle. And I just really, really got back out there and me constantly going to programs and trying to get a job and you know, they denying me a few times. I had to go back and get my GED. I didn't complete that and I just got real frustrated in order to get a good job you got to have a GED, you know so.

Things I felt it might sound like a excuse but I just felt real like hopeless and that's the only thing that I really knew in my life was selling drugs. So I went right back to it.

Q. You also went back, I could understand that maybe you wanted to support yourself and your family but that doesn't require you to shoot people, does it? Did that require yo

1 | shoot people?

A. Just by you being out on the street selling drugs, anything could happen and you're dealing with different kind of people. You are not dealing with people like you or people like y'all, nine to five. I'm dealing with people that everybody is just scheming and everybody is just out for they self and a lot of people do get killed over drug money and over materials, a lot of material things.

So by you being out on the streets and selling drugs you got to have something to protect yourself whoever you are with even if yourself with you just by yourself and you against the world. If you got friends and other people that's doing the same thing, as well as you, we all gonna have guns. We all gonna drugs, sell drugs and whoever feel like they gone take our stuff or come where we live at and get our customers and we feel like they violating, yes, we gone do every means necessary.

- Q. So, if I understand you correctly, every one has a gun so you had to have a gun; is that right?
- A. It's just a way of life.
- Q. But you were violating the other people weren't on supervised release, were they?
- 23 A. Say that again.
- Q. The other people were not on supervised release, as far as you know, right?

- 1 A. Some was and some wasn't.
- 2 | Q. And you were violating the terms of supervised release?
- 3 A. Yes, I was, sir.
- 4 | Q. You told the judge that you were going to live up to the
- 5 | supervised release that he imposed but you immediately went out
- 6 and started selling drugs. You immediately went out and
- 7 | started to violate the law and to shoot people, correct?
- 8 | A. I didn't -- it's just like you don't wake up in the morning
- 9 and say I am just going to shoot somebody. It doesn't happen
- 10 | like that. You know. If the problem comes your way, then as a
- 11 result to that that's how it goes where we come from and where
- 12 we live.
- 13 | Q. And then putting aside for a moment the gun part of it, you
- 14 started selling drugs again, right?
- 15 A. Yes, I started selling drugs.
- 16 | Q. And you pled guilty to being in possession of 31 bags of
- 17 | marijuana; do you remember that?
- 18 | A. Yes, sir.
- 19 | Q. It's a felony, right?
- 20 A. I think it's a misdemeanor.
- 21 Q. OK. How many months did you get for that?
- 22 | A. I got four months, sir.
- 23 | Q. Then you went back on supervised release again. That was
- 24 | in 2013, correct, summer of 2013, correct?
- 25 A. I'm not for sure but I did, after that I did come out and

- 1 start selling drugs, sir.
- 2 Q. And you went in again. You came out again. You start
- 3 selling drugs again, right?
- 4 | A. Yes, sir.
- 5 | Q. You used a weapon to shoot people, correct?
- 6 A. Like I said you just don't --
- 7 Q. Just answer my question; yes or no?
- 8 A. I have did. I have, yes.
- 9 Q. How many people did you shoot at and hit?
- 10 A. Say that again.
- 11 Q. How many people did you shoot at and hit?
- 12 A. One person.
- 13 Q. What year was that?
- 14 A. That was when the guy shot me.
- 15 | Q. Now --
- 16 A. As well, if I could rephrase that. It was two people. The
- 17 | incident with my friend mother when I came home and before then
- 18 | it was the incident when the guy shot me and I shot him back.
- 19 | Q. And you came back in again for violation of supervised
- 20 | release, correct?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 \parallel Q. And that was in July or the summer of 2015, correct?
- 23 A. I think it was in August or July.
- 24 | Q. But that's when you went into jail?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. And the judge this time really gave you a break. You had violated the law then you came in and you violated supervised
- 3 release and you violated again, right?
- 4 A. Yes, sir.
- 5 | Q. And were you selling drugs at that point?
- 6 | A. Yes, sir.
- 7 | Q. Were you using weapons?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. He gave you 60 days, right?
- 10 A. Yes, he did.
- 11 | Q. Then the feds got you again in 2016, November of 2016,
- 12 | correct?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. And you were indicted on three charges, right?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. You were indicted for drugs, selling drugs, conspiracy to
- 17 | sell drugs, right?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And conspiracy to -- I'm sorry -- possession of firearms
- 20 | and discharging them, correct?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. And then eventually a third charge was added; do you
- 23 remember.
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. And that was with the Flybridge group, correct?

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. The Flybridge group, the timeframe for that activity was
- 3 | around 2014, 2016, correct?
- 4 | A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And the place where the Flybridge group was doing all this
- 6 criminal activity was on around 165 Street and Ogden Avenue?
- 7 | What was the location?
- 8 A. Flybridge is all over. It comes to the projects all the
- 9 | way to Nelson/Anderson. Everybody know each other. So
- 10 everybody call each other "Flybridge".
- 11 | Q. So is it fair to say then in 2014 you were dealing with the
- 12 | Flybridge people, not with Mr. Polk, correct?
- 13 | A. In 2000 and what?
- 14 | Q. '14 to 2015.
- 15 | A. Like I said, from Highbridge from when me and Polk lived to
- 16 | throughout Anderson, Nelson, we all know each other. So we all
- 17 mess with each other.
- 18 | Q. Mr. Polk wasn't indicted in that case, was he?
- 19 MR. KROUSE: Objection, your Honor.
- 20 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 21 | Q. The time period is the same time period as in this case,
- 22 || right?
- 23 | A. Say that again.
- 24 | Q. The timeframe for the Flybridge case was about the same as
- 25 | the indictment in this case, right?

```
I9CAAPOL1
                                Williams - Cross
1
               MR. KROUSE: Objection, your Honor.
2
               THE COURT: Overruled.
3
               You can answer.
      Q. Do you remember that the -- you've seen the indictment in
 4
5
      the Flybridge case, haven't you?
6
     A. Yes, sir.
 7
               MR. LIND: I'd like to offer it as Defendant's Exhibit
8
     Α.
9
               MR. KROUSE: Objection.
10
               THE COURT: Let me see the exhibit.
11
               Come up to the side bar.
12
               (Continued on next page)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

Williams - Cross

1 (At the sidebar)

THE COURT: What do you want to prove, Mr. Lind, by the allegations in this indictment?

MR. LIND: What he was charged with and that the time frame is the same as the allegations in this indictment.

THE COURT: Well, you can ask him what he was charged with, whether he was aware of what he was charged with.

MR. LIND: Okay. Fine.

THE COURT: I'm not sure what else that you wanted to do with it.

MR. LIND: All right. Fair enough, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay.

(In open court)

14 BY MR. LIND:

- Q. Now, do you recall that the time period for the allegations in the Flybridge indictment were from 2014 to 2016?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- Q. And you remember that you were charged with a conspiracy to sell drugs, correct?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. You were also charged in one count with firing at a guy
- 22 | named Lacen. Do you remember that?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. When was that?
- 25 A. It was December 2015. I'm not sure.

- 1 | Q. It was like May of 2015, right?
- 2 A. I don't know exactly the month, but I know it was the
- 3 summertime. It was hot.
- 4 \square Q. Was that in a park?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Was that Nelson Park?
- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you remember being interviewed by the government after
- 9 you were arrested?
- 10 | A. Yes, sir.
- 11 | Q. And you realized you were being charged with that count,
- 12 || right?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 Q. You denied that you shot Mr. Lacen, correct?
- MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, time frame?
- MR. LIND: Time frame for what?
- MR. KROUSE: What he is asking about. Mr. Lind said
- 18 when you were interviewed by the government, and now he's --
- 19 THE COURT: Don't argue.
- 20 MR. LIND: I'll give it a time frame.
- 21 BY MR. LIND:
- 22 | Q. Do you remember shortly after you were arrested, you were
- 23 | interviewed by a bunch of people, law enforcement officials?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. And you made a postarrest statement, correct? Or you

I9CKPOL2

- 1 | talked to them anyway, correct?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 | Q. And they told you your Miranda rights, you said you could
- 4 proceed without an attorney being present, right?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Do you remember that they asked you about the shooting that
- 7 | you committed -- that you were alleged to have committed in
- 8 | Nelson Park? Do you remember being asked about that?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. And you denied that you did it, correct?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And that was false, correct?
- 13 A. I wasn't -- I wasn't planning on cooperating.
- 14 | Q. No, no. My question is: Was that false, or was it true?
- 15 A. In that testimony right there, I was telling the truth, and
- 16 then I was -- and then I was -- and then I wasn't. There were
- 17 some things I was telling the truth about and some things I
- 18 | wasn't.
- 19 Q. Well, were you telling the truth when you told them that
- 20 you had not -- you were not involved in the shooting of
- 21 Mr. Lacen? Yes or no.
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. You were telling them the truth?
- 24 A. I was -- no, I wasn't telling them the truth. I told them
- 25 | I was there at the scene, but I told them I didn't fire no gun.

- 1 | Q. And that was a lie?
- $2 \parallel A. \text{ Yes, it was.}$
- 3 Q. Eventually you pled guilty to three charges in the case --
- 4 | in the other case to which you pled guilty. Do you remember?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. You pled quilty to selling drugs, correct?
- 7 | A. Yes.

8

- Q. You pled guilty to discharging a firearm, correct?
- 9 | A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. And that was the firearm that was fired at Mr. Lacen,
- 11 correct? Or were there other shootings that you were also
- 12 charged with?
- 13 A. No, that was the only shooting.
- 14 | Q. And then you were also charged with intimidating a witness?
- 15 | A. Yes, I was.
- 16 | Q. And you pled guilty to all three of those charges, correct?
- 17 | A. Yes, I did.
- 18 | Q. When did you -- I withdraw that.
- 19 In the period between when you were released from jail
- 20 on the supervised release term until 2016, when you were
- 21 arrested in the federal charges, you continued to engage in
- 22 | violence, correct?
- 23 | A. Yes. I was in the possession of a handgun, and I was still
- 24 selling crack cocaine, but as far as -- when I came home from
- 25 | my last violation, I didn't get in no more trouble.

I9CKPOL2

- 1 | Q. You had handguns, right?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. You didn't use them to shoot at anyone?
- 4 | A. No, sir.
- 5 | Q. And you kept on selling crack cocaine, though, right?
- 6 A. Yes, I did.
- 7 | Q. With the guys from the Flybridge group, right?
- 8 A. Really with people that's from my projects. We all know
- 9 | each other as well. Like I said, we all help each other out.
- 10 We all hang on the same corners, and we all look out for each
- 11 other. But the people I was hanging with was Polk, Buddha Man,
- 12 | Tyrell, and Tim.
- 13 | Q. 2015, when you got out, Mr. Polk was in jail, right?
- 14 A. Two thousand what?
- 15 || Q. '15.
- In October 2015, when you got off of supervised
- 17 | release, okay --
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 Q. -- until when you got arrested in November of 2016,
- 20 Mr. Polk wasn't around, was he?
- 21 A. No, he wasn't around.
- 22 | Q. So you couldn't have been selling drugs with him, he was in
- 23 | jail, right?
- 24 A. Yes. But what I'm trying to say is before that, everything
- 25 | that I did with Mr. Polk was before I got violated on my last

- violation. So any other crime that I did with him, that was
 before then. Other than to -- when I came home, I was doing
 that with other people that was out there, like Buddha, Tim,
- Q. Now, you told us yesterday what you want to have as your sentence. Do you recall that?
 - A. Yes.

4

7

20

8 Q. You want to have time served?

and other people from other blocks.

- 9 A. I said that as far as the lowest -- like the lowest
 10 sentence possible. I think anybody would say that, you know.
- 11 | Q. You're the one who said it?
- 12 | A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And you want to get time served -- despite all the things
 you did, you don't think you should get any more time than time
 served, do you?
- A. It's not up to me, it's up to the judge. And I just feel like me telling the truth, and me trying to get this part of my chapter of my life over with, and about me telling the truth, and getting everything off my chest is the right thing to do
- 21 Q. But you want time served, right?

for me moving forward on, so...

- 22 A. If it's possible, yes.
- Q. Now, talking about the gun on University Avenue -- do you remember that?
- 25 A. Say that again.

- Q. There was a gun that was used allegedly by Mr. Polk on University Avenue. Do you recall that?
 - A. Yes, sir.

3

4

- Q. You said yesterday that it was a Glock .40?
- $5 \parallel A. \text{ Yes, sir.}$
- Q. Do you remember telling someone that you thought it was a .380 pistol? Do you remember telling someone that?
- 8 | A. No, sir.
- 9 MR. LIND: Can I just have a moment, Judge?
- 10 | May I have one moment, Judge?
- 11 THE COURT: Yes.
- 12 (Pause)
- 13 MR. LIND: I think I found it.
- I'm sorry, Judge. I apologize to you and the jury.
- 15 Q. Do you remember telling the government during a proffer
- 16 session that Kev and Tyrell shot at Euro outside of 1055
- 17 University Avenue and that Williams believes that Terrell used
- 18 | the .380 pistol?
- 19 A. They must have got it confused when I was telling them
- 20 that, but I guarantee he shot the guy with a .40 caliber.
- 21 | Q. Okay. So they got it confused when they took that down?
- 22 A. Yeah, because Kevin had a .38 revolver.
- 23 | Q. Do you remember telling them at a later point that Terrell
- 24 | Polk used a .9 millimeter gun --
- 25 A. No.

- 1 | Q. -- during that shooting?
- 2 A. No, I don't recall that.
- 3 Q. Do you remember telling them, in discussing the shooting at
- 4 Anderson Avenue, that Terrell used a .9 millimeter and that Kev
- 5 used a .380 revolver?
- 6 A. Anderson Avenue? No, sir.
- 7 | Q. Not Anderson. University Avenue?
- 8 A. Say that again.
- 9 | O. Yes.
- Do you remember telling them in an interview on
- 11 September 20, 2017, that Terrell used a .9 millimeter in
- 12 | connection with the shooting of Euro?
- 13 A. I remember telling them that he used the .40 caliber.
- 14 | Q. So they got that wrong when they were interviewing you?
- 15 A. They had to.
- 16 Q. Now let's talk about the shooting on Anderson Avenue.
- You found out about that not from Mr. Polk, but you
- 18 | heard about it on TV, right?
- 19 A. Say that again?
- 20 | O. Yes.
- 21 You testified yesterday that you found out about that
- 22 | from Mr. Polk, about the shooting on Anderson Avenue?
- 23 | A. Yes, I did.
- 24 | Q. Do you remember telling the government that you found out
- 25 about it by watching TV?

6

7

9

Williams - Cross

- A. I found out about it by Polk and watching the TV, Channel
 2 12.
- Q. But you didn't mention Polk, you mentioned watching it on TV, correct? Do you remember that?
 - A. I remember telling them both. Why would I say that?
 - Q. Mr. Polk told you that -- according to you, that the reason for the shooting was a beef between -- about women between Polk

I remember telling them that the beef occurred with Kevin

- 8 and this guy, Ryan. Do you remember telling them that?
- 10 in situations that I had with individuals that hang out with
- 11 Ryan, and him and Ryan didn't like each other as well on
- 12 account of Terrell messing with his child's mother. So they
- didn't like each other just because of that, so our problem
- 14 with each other is just like fuel to the fire.
- 15 | Q. Well, you weren't there when this occurred, right?
- 16 A. No, sir.
- Q. And Mr. Polk told you that this had to do with him sleeping with Ryan's babysitter, right?
- 19 A. No, he never told me that.
- 20 | Q. What did he tell you, then?
- 21 A. He told me that he had caught Ryan, and it's pertaining to
- 22 | the situation that happened in the car with me -- with Kevin,
- 23 | with Bubba taking Kevin out the car, telling him he can't be in
- 24 | the car, pulling out a gun out on Kevin, and Kevin came back to
- 25 us and told us, and we went over there and approached Bubba

- with our guns, and further on from that day, it was like a go, it was a beef for all of us.
- 3 Q. Now, the shotgun that you were talking about during your
- 4 testimony yesterday that was supposedly used during the
- 5 shooting at Anderson Avenue --
- 6 | A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. -- you told the authorities that you gave him -- who gave
- 8 | him the sawed-off shotgun?
- 9 A. He got it himself.
- 10 | O. From whom?
- 11 A. From a friend that he knew about.
- 12 | Q. So he got the shotgun himself?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. You didn't give it to him?
- 15 A. I didn't give it to him.
- 16 Q. Didn't you tell the authorities that you gave him the
- 17 | shotqun?
- 18 A. I told the authorities that we all shared all the guns that
- 19 | we had. I told them all the guns that we possessed, and that
- 20 we shared these guns, and that was one of the guns that we
- 21 | shared.
- 22 | Q. Did you tell the authorities, on or about February 23,
- 23 | 2017, that you had sold --
- 24 | A. Two thousand and what?
- 25 || Q. '17.

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. -- that you had sold Rell the shotgun that he used to
- 3 commit the shooting on Anderson Avenue?
- 4 | A. No.
- 5 Q. Once again, they made a mistake about what you told them,
- 6 correct?
- 7 A. I'm just telling you the truth. He got that -- the other
- 8 guns -- some of the guns in our possession, and I bought that
- 9 | from somebody else as well as he bought the shotgun and a
- 10 revolver from whoever he bought it from.
- 11 | Q. Didn't you also tell them that he got the shotgun from a
- 12 | kid in the projects?
- 13 | A. Yes, I did.
- 14 | Q. So which one is it? Is that the person who sold him the
- 15 | shotqun?
- 16 | A. Yes, it got to be. I didn't get into details. He told me
- 17 he got it from a kid in the projects.
- 18 Q. Now, Mr. Polk was not part of any conspiracy until 2014,
- 19 | correct?
- 20 A. Say that again?
- 21 | Q. Mr. Polk was not part of your gang until 2014, March of
- 22 | 2014, correct?
- 23 A. 2014, I came home, but two thousand -- before 2014, he's
- 24 | like my childhood friend. He's --
- 25 | Q. He was in jail from 2007 to 2014, right?

9

Williams - Cross

- A. So we know each other for -- since we was young. We consult with each other, and that's the reason why we did anything for each other. As far as us hanging with each other, selling drugs, if I got problems with somebody, he got problems with somebody, as well as Buddha Man, Kevin, Tim, we all -- you
- Q. I'm talking about the time period from 2013 to 2017. He wasn't around in 2013, right? Mr. Polk was not around in 2013?
 - A. Then he came home the beginning of 2014.

know, that was just the --

- Q. By the way, we have a lot of exhibits here about various matters. Did you have any telephone calls that you had regarding the period from 2014 to 2015, before he went into
- prison, that commemorate any sales of you with drugs?
- 14 A. The phones that we had, we throw them away. We had them
 15 one week, and the next week, we don't, but I don't think so.
- Q. You have nothing regarding any videos or anything like that, right?
- 18 A. No, sir.
- Q. Nothing regarding any documents or anything like that that would corroborate your testimony?
- 21 A. No, sir.
- 22 Q. During the period that you sold drugs to Mr. Polk, it was
- 23 | 12 or 18 months, right?
- 24 A. From then, 12, 18 months?
- 25 | Q. From March of 2014 to August of 2018.

- 1 A. August 2018?
 - Q. I'm sorry, not '18. 2015.

3 You said in your testimony that you sold to him sixty

- 4 | to a hundred grams of crack during that period, right?
- 5 A. I said about four or five times. I don't -- 15 to
- 6 20 grams, he had purchased, that I had got from my connect, my
- 7 | supplier, because he -- Terrell can't get to his supplier, so I
- 8 went to my supplier and got work -- drugs from him to give to
- 9 him.

2

- 10 | Q. Now, 100 grams of crack is less than four ounces, right?
- 11 | A. No.
- 12 You said it's less than four ounces?
- 13 Q. Yes.
- 14 | A. Yeah.
- 15 | Q. It's about three and a half ounces of crack during an
- 16 entire year and a half?
- 17 A. Yeah, three ounces. 28 a gram, an ounce.
- MR. LIND: May I have a moment, Judge, to talk to my
- 19 | client?
- 20 THE COURT: Yes.
- Do you want to take a break, Mr. Lind?
- 22 MR. LIND: Yes.
- 23 | THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, why don't we take a
- 24 | 15-minute break. Don't discuss the case. Keep an open mind.
- 25 | (Jury not present)

I9CKPOL2

25

Williams - Cross

1 (Recess) THE COURT: Mr. Lind, are you ready to continue? 2 3 MR. LIND: Yes. 4 THE COURT: All right. So let's get the jury. 5 (Jury present) 6 MR. LIND: May I proceed, Judge? 7 THE COURT: Yes, sir. BY MR. LIND: 8 9 Q. Mr. Williams, you sold Terrell Polk, we were talking about 10 just before, some crack for resale, right? 11 Say that again? 12 You sold Mr. Polk crack, so he could sell that, correct? 13 A. He bought some product from -- cocaine, so he could cook it 14 up and sell crack. 15 Q. Okay. So that was -- now, when Mr. Polk converted it to crack and sold it, he didn't give you any of the profits from 16 17 that, did he? 18 A. No, as I don't give him a profit from mine. Q. Right. So you were not a partnership in terms of selling 19 20 this crack, right? 21 A. No, it's not a partnership, but the way we was selling 22 crack at, not anybody could come over there and sell crack if 23 they wasn't with us. 24 Q. I understand that.

But your financial arrangement had nothing to do with

- 1 | you selling him crack or cocaine, right?
- 2 A. All it is is just looking out for each other.
- 3 | Q. No. What I'm asking about is your financial arrangement
- 4 | with him when you sold him cocaine, which he could convert into
- 5 crack, right?
- 6 That was just like an arrangement where you were the
- 7 seller, and he was the buyer, nothing more, correct?
- 8 A. I was doing a favor for him.
- 9 | Q. You were giving him crack -- or cocaine because his other
- 10 | supplier was not around, right?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. Or had none?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Now, going back to the agreement that you have with the
- 15 | government, right now you're facing a mandatory minimum of 20
- 16 years, correct?
- 17 | A. Yes, sir.
- 18 | Q. Are you a career offender under the guidelines?
- 19 A. I don't think so. I'm not sure, sir.
- 20 | Q. Well, do you have any other narcotics convictions?
- 21 A. Yes, that I got locked up for. I did my two years.
- 22 | Q. Do you have any crimes of violence convictions?
- 23 A. No, not -- besides the indictment that I had copped out to
- 24 when I first got arrested.
- 25 | Q. So that's the only crime of violence you have?

- 1 A. That I got convicted to -- convicted for.
- Q. The way things stand now, unless you get a letter from the
- 3 government, you have to do at least 20 years, correct?
- 4 A. Say that again?
- 5 Q. The way things stand now, unless you get the government to
- 6 write you a letter -- unless the government writes a letter on
- 7 | your behalf, you're going to be doing at least 20 years for the
- 8 crimes you admit?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. And even if your attorney wrote the best letter in the
- 11 | world to the judge, the judge can't go under 20 years, correct?
- 12 A. The judge can do what he want.
- 13 | Q. He can go under 20 years? Is that your understanding?
- 14 A. That is my understanding, that the judge can do what he
- 15 want. If I got a letter, and if I was truthful and
- 16 corroborated --
- 17 | Q. But that's what I'm asking. Let's say the government
- 18 | didn't write you a letter, let's say your attorney wrote you a
- 19 | letter, right, and it was a great letter, could the judge go
- 20 under 20 years? Yes or no.
- 21 A. No. The government got to write the letter.
- 22 | Q. Right. So you're depending on the government writing you a
- 23 | letter, right?
- 24 A. That was part of the agreement, me being truthful, me being
- 25 | honest, tell the truth for the crimes that I committed, and

Williams - Redirect

- what the crimes that I did with others, being assistance to them.
- 3 Q. So the government is getting something, and you're getting
- 4 something, right? You're living off each other, correct?
- $5 \parallel A$. If you say so.
- 6 Q. Well, I'm asking you.
- 7 A. It's part of the agreement.
- 8 MR. LIND: I have nothing further.
- 9 THE COURT: Any further questions?
- 10 MR. KROUSE: Yes, your Honor, briefly.
- 11 THE COURT: Sure.
- 12 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 13 BY MR. KROUSE:
- 14 Q. Good morning, Mr. Williams.
- 15 A. Good morning.
- 16 Q. Do you recall Mr. Lind asking you about a few drug
- 17 convictions you had in the state in the past?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. You testified on direct examination that you sold drugs
- 20 essentially continuously from the age of 15 until you were
- 21 arrested on this case, correct?
- 22 | A. Yes, sir.
- 23 | Q. Isn't it fair to say that sometimes when you sold drugs,
- 24 you were arrested by the NYPD?
- 25 A. Yes.

Williams - Redirect

- Q. And then you were convicted of a few of those offenses, correct?
- 3 A. Yes. I pleaded guilty, but no jail time.
- Q. You pled guilty to a few drug offenses in the state,
- 5 correct?
- 6 | A. Yes, sir.
- 7 Q. You recall Mr. Lind asking you about several of the
- 8 shootings and the assault that you testified to on direct
- 9 examination yesterday. Do you remember those questions?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. For those shootings -- the one in 1996, the one in 2002,
- 12 | the one in 2007, and for the ones in 2015 -- you've never been
- 13 charged with any of those shootings, correct?
- 14 A. No.
- 15 | Q. You've never been arrested for any of those shootings?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 MR. LIND: Judge, asked and answered yesterday.
- 18 THE COURT: Overruled. I'll let that stand. Let's
- 19 move on.
- 20 Q. And you've never been convicted of any of those offenses,
- 21 || correct?
- 22 A. No. For the one in 2015.
- 23 | Q. That's this case, correct? That's what you pled quilty to
- 24 | in this case?
- 25 A. For the indictment, I came and got arrested for. I got --

- 1 | I pled guilty to that.
- 2 MR. LIND: Judge, I object to the question. I don't
- 3 know what he means by this case, the 2015 --
- THE COURT: I'm not sure the witness is following you either.
- 6 MR. KROUSE: Yes, your Honor. I'll clarify.
- 7 BY MR. KROUSE:
- 8 Q. When you told the jury about all these offenses that you
- 9 were not arrested for or convicted for, how did the government
- 10 | know about those crimes that you committed?
- 11 A. I had told them. I had told them.
- 12 | Q. So you told the government about committing those crimes,
- 13 | correct?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. Do you recall Mr. Lind asking a few questions about
- 16 | statements that you made to the government in proffer sessions?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. And you recall Mr. Lind referring to notes that were taken
- 19 during those proffer sessions?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Now, when you had these proffer sessions and discussions
- 22 | with the government, was there someone generally taking notes
- 23 of what you were saying?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. And those are the notes Mr. Lind is referring to, correct?

I9CKPOL2

Williams - Redirect

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. Did you take those notes?
- $3 \parallel A.$ No, sir.
- 4 Q. Did you ever review those notes for accuracy?
- 5 | A. No.
- 6 Q. Have you ever even seen those notes?
- 7 | A. No.
- 8 | Q. You recall Mr. Lind asking you about this Flybridge group,
- 9 correct?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. Is it fair to say that you, in addition to committing
- 12 crimes with Mr. Polk, Mr. Moss, Tim, and Kevin, also committed
- 13 | various crimes with other people?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. And the government asked you about those other crimes that
- 16 you committed with other people, correct?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. And you were truthful about your involvement in those
- 19 crimes with other people, correct?
- 20 A. Yes, I did -- yes, I was.
- 21 | Q. Do you recall Mr. Lind asking you about documentation that
- 22 | might corroborate your drug conspiracy with Mr. Polk? Do you
- 23 | recall those questions?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. And you recall him asking if you had any recorded phone

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

Williams - Redirect

- calls that you could play that would corroborate what you're saying here?
- A. No. I told him I don't have no phone calls. I never have no phone calls.
 - Q. Do you recall saying -- testifying that you threw out your phones once a week, around that pace?
 - A. Once every two weeks, we change our phone number or we throw our phone away.
 - Q. And did you do that to avoid having recorded phone calls and avoid having records --

MR. LIND: Objection to leading, Judge.

- THE COURT: Yes, I'm going to sustain as to the leading.
- Q. Why did you throw out your phones every two weeks?
 - A. For somebody might be listening, law enforcement might be listening, and it's not good to have the same phone. And you on the street dealing drugs and doing the things we was doing, it's not good to have a phone for too long.
- 19 Q. You don't want records out there, correct?
 - A. No.
- 21 MR. LIND: Objection to leading, Judge.
- 22 | THE COURT: I'll overrule it. I'll let that stand.
- 23 MR. KROUSE: Nothing further, your Honor.
- 24 MR. LIND: Just very brief, Judge?
- 25 THE COURT: Sure.

Williams - recross

- 1 RECROSS EXAMINATION
- 2 BY MR. LIND:
- 3 | Q. You were asked a question on redirect -- I'm sorry, on
- 4 cross or whatever by Mr. Krouse about the Flybridge group. You
- 5 | remember that?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. That you engaged in illegal activity with them at the same
- 8 | time that you were engaged in illegal activity with Mr. Polk
- 9 and the other people whose names and faces are on that board,
- 10 | correct?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. Do you remember telling the jury at least twice yesterday
- 13 | that your dealings in drugs and narcotics activity was six to
- 14 seven days a week with this group, with the group of Mr. Polk
- 15 | and the other people, from 2014 to 2015? Do you remember
- 16 | telling them that yesterday?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. So which is it? You had, what, a couple of seconds to
- 19 spend with the other group or you had a couple of seconds to
- 20 spend with Mr. Polk and these other people?
- 21 A. It's not about having a couple of seconds. It's we all
- 22 | from the same block. Everybody is a block away from each
- 23 other, so we interact with each other all day, every day.
- 24 | Q. But that's not the same group, right? The Flybridge group
- is not the same group as Mr. Polk is involved in, correct?

9

10

11

15

16

17

21

Williams - recross

- A. That's what they -- that's what they call us cuz we all from Highbridge. So they just say Flybridge, but we all from different blocks, but --
- 4 | Q. Are you saying that Mr. Polk, Mr. Moss, Mr. Smith,
- 5 Mr. Corbett were all part of the Flybridge group?
 - A. As far as -- I'm from the projects, and --
- Q. No. My question is: Are they all part of the Flybridge group? Very simple question.
 - A. They call -- they call Highbridge Flybridge, so, yes.
 - Q. They were not indicted, though, in that indictment?

 MR. KROUSE: Objection, your Honor.
- 12 THE COURT: Sustained.
- Q. Isn't it a fact that after 2014 -- 2014, 2015, you were dealing primarily with this Flybridge group, not with Mr. Polk?
 - A. I don't know exactly what he was doing with individuals -other individuals on the block. Everybody -- we don't discuss
 about everything we do with everybody, but we all interact with
- 18 | each other.
- Q. But were you part of the same group? You weren't part of the Highbridge group, with these people, you were part of the
- 22 A. It's the same thing. We all from Highbridge. There's

Flybridge group; isn't that right?

- 23 no -- we from the projects, and they from Summit, Nelson,
- Ogden, a block away or two blocks away. We all interact with
- 25 | each other.

```
In other words, you interact, but they're separate
1
      entities, aren't they?
 2
 3
     A. Yes.
 4
               MR. LIND: Nothing further.
 5
               THE COURT: Any further questions?
 6
               MR. KROUSE: No, your Honor. Thank you.
 7
               THE COURT: You can step down.
 8
               (Witness excused)
9
               THE COURT: Are you prepared to move forward with the
10
     next witness?
11
               MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: All right. Why don't you call the
13
      government's next witness.
14
               MR. FOLLY: The government calls Detective Claressa
     Prior.
15
16
       CLARESSA PRIOR,
17
           called as a witness by the Government,
18
           having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
19
               THE LAW CLERK: Please state and spell your name for
20
      the record.
21
               THE WITNESS: Detective Prior, P-r-i-o-r.
22
               MR. FOLLY: May I inquire, your Honor?
23
               THE COURT: Yes, sir, Mr. Folly.
```

25

Claressa Prior- Direct

- 1 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 2 BY MR. FOLLY:
- 3 Q. Detective Prior, where do you work?
- 4 A. Sixth Precinct.
- 5 | Q. Is the Sixth Precinct part of the New York City Police
- 6 | Department?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. What is your title there?
- 9 A. Detective, investigator.
- 10 | Q. How long have you been a detective for?
- 11 A. Approximately about six years.
- 12 | Q. In total, how many years have you been at the NYPD?
- 13 A. Thirteen.
- 14 | Q. Before you became a detective in your current squad, what
- 15 | was your title?
- 16 A. Undercover.
- 17 | Q. What does it mean to be an undercover officer?
- 18 A. Basically work as a -- still work as a police officer in an
- 19 | undercover capacity where we gain intelligence, you make
- 20 | narcotic buys sometimes, more or less.
- 21 | Q. When you say you work in an undercover capacity, what do
- 22 | you mean by that?
- 23 | A. Undercover capacity whereas you're not in uniform. The
- 24 people you're around, they don't necessarily know that you're a
- 25 police officer.

- 1 BY MR. FOLLY:
- 2 | Q. What types of assignments did you have as an undercover
- 3 | officer?
- 4 A. Assignments included "case buys" and "buy and bust".
- 5 Q. Let's talk about both of those for just a moment. What is
- 6 case buy"?
- 7 A. A case buy is where you would make a buy and the individual
- 8 | that you are buying from is not arrested immediately.
- 9 Q. What about a "buy and bust"?
- 10 A. That was where s you would make a buy and the person would
- 11 be arrested at that same day.
- 12 | Q. When you participate in a case buy or a buy and bust, what
- 13 | is your role?
- 14 A. Sorry. Can you repeat that?
- 15 \parallel Q. When you are participating in a case buy or a buy bust,
- 16 | what is your role?
- 17 A. Have several roles. As undercover you can ghost, you can
- 18 buy or you can gain intelligence.
- 19 | Q. Can you explain to the jury what it means when you say "you
- 20 can ghost"?
- 21 A. "Ghost" is another role of an undercover or someone who
- 22 used to be an undercover. You are basically the eyes and ears
- 23 | to the team and you make sure the undercover is safe.
- 24 | Q. And you said another role is "you can buy". Can you
- 25 explain what that means?

- A. "Buy" meaning that you would buy narcotics in the situation

 I was in.
- 3 Q. And the last one you said was intelligence gathering. What
- 4 | did you mean by that?
- 5 A. In intelligence gathering you would just take information
- 6 | that you would gain from being outside on the street and relate
- 7 back to your team.
- 8 | Q. In addition to your role as an undercover, as well as
- 9 | ghost, are there other law enforcement officers who are
- 10 | involved in undercover purchases?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Who are those other officers?
- 13 A. Your field team.
- 14 | Q. What is the role of the field team?
- 15 A. The field team they actually make the arrest and they also
- 16 make sure the undercover is safe.
- 17 | Q. As an undercover officer did you purchase crack cocaine at
- 18 | times?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Approximately, how many undercover purchases of crack
- 21 cocaine did you make?
- 22 A. About 50.
- 23 | O. About 50?
- 24 | A. Fifty.
- 25 | Q. Directing your attention to May 25, 2013, were you involved

- 1 | in an undercover purchase of crack cocaine on that day?
- 2 | A. Yes.

7

- 3 Q. Where did that undercover purchase take place?
- 4 A. In the Bronx in front of 1055 University Place.
- 5 | Q. Who did you purchase the crack cocaine from on that date?
- 6 A. JD Buddha.
 - Q. What do you mean when you say "JD"?
- 8 A. That's the name that he, the person or whomever you buy
- 9 | from is referred to as John Doe and then you have another --
- 10 | you use something that you can identify that person to and
- 11 | they're "JD" and whatever that item is, Whether it's something
- 12 | that they wear or the name or what have you but it's always
- 13 "JD" first that's how we always refer to some people when he
- 14 | engage with.
- 15 Q. In other words, is everyone you buy narcotics from as a UC
- 16 referred to as "JD"?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Was Buddha the particular name that you knew this subject
- 19 by?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- MR. FOLLY: Mr. Concepcion, can you please publish
- 22 | what is in evidence as Government Exhibit Three.
- 23 | Q. Detective Prior, do you recognize this individual?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- Q. Who is it?

- 1 | A. JD Buddha.
- 2 | Q. Prior to May 25, 2013 had you met Buddha before?
- 3 | A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. Approximately, when did you first meet him?
- 5 A. About, I would say month or two before that date.
- 6 Q. Where did you first meet him?
- 7 A. 1055 University Place, Apartment 1 Frank.
- Q. And when you met him on that date were you in your role as
- 9 an undercover officer?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. Can you describe how you met him on that date?
- 12 A. Sure. I went to the apartment to look for someone else
- 13 | that I had purchased narcotics from at another time and another
- 14 | individual opened the door and then he came JD Buddha came to
- 15 | the door and I spoke to him and asked him for the person I was
- 16 | looking for.
- 17 | Q. Who were you looking for on that occasion?
- 18 | A. JD Gray.
- 19 Q. Was that another subject in your narcotics investigation?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 MR. FOLLY: Mr. Concepcion, can you publish what's in
- 22 | evidence as Government Exhibit two.
- 23 | Q. Detective Prior, do you recognize this individual?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- Q. Who is it?

Prior - Direct

- 1 A. That's the person that opened the door.
- 2 | Q. That's the person that opened the door when you went to the
- 3 | apartment?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 | Q. And who else was present in the apartment?
- 6 A. JD Buddha.
- 7 | Q. Can you describe the apartment to the jury?
- 8 A. Sure. The apartment was pretty small. It's more or less
- 9 | like a trap house where there is any furniture, a mattress on
- 10 | the floor. It didn't give the appearance that anyone was
- 11 | actually living there.
- 12 | Q. Can you describe what you observed inside the apartment?
- 13 A. Sure. A chair and a mattress on the floor.
- 14 | Q. Was there anything on the mattress?
- 15 A. No, no sheets.
- 16 | Q. You mentioned that Buddha was present in the apartment on
- 17 | that day?
- 18 | A. Yes.

- 19 | Q. What, if anything, did he say to you?
- 20 A. He basically just told me that the person --
- 21 MR. LIND: Objection, judge.
- 22 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 23 You can answer.
- 24 A. He told me the person I was looking for wasn't there.
 - Q. What did you do at that point?

Prior - Direct

- 1 | A. I left.
- 2 | Q. Directing your attention back to May 25, 2013. Did you see
- 3 | Buddha on that date?
- 4 | A. Yes.
- 5 | Q. Where was that?
- 6 A. In front of 1055 University.
- 7 | Q. Is that the same location where you first met Buddha?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. What happened when you saw him?
- 10 A. We engaged in drug related conversation. I gave him U.S.
- 11 currency in exchange for four twists of crack cocaine.
- 12 Q. What is a twist of crack?
- 13 A. A twist of crack is the package. It is an actual twist
- 14 where the crack is placed into.
- 15 | Q. And what is the packaging made of?
- 16 A. Plastic.
- 17 | Q. How did you pay him for it? How much did you pay him for
- 18 | it?
- 19 A. \$40.
- 20 | 0. So that was ten dollars a twist?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 MR. FOLLY: If we could go to what's in evidence as
- 23 Government Exhibit 530.
- 24 (Pause)
- 25 | Q. Do you recognize this?

Prior - Direct

1 | A. Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 2 | Q. How do you recognize it?
- A. How do I recognize it? That's the location where I purchased narcotics from JD Buddha.
- Q. Looking at this photo, can you describe for the jury where
 Buddha gave you the narcotics?
 - A. Sure. Right in front of the black gate.

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, if we could briefly just read in a portion of a stipulation. We had previously read in one paragraph and now we'll read the second paragraph.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. FOLLY: The parties stipulate that the substance contained in Government Exhibit 103 was sold by Jamel Moss to an undercover law enforcement officer on May 25, 2013 and is assigned voucher number 2000213241. The substance contained in Government Exhibit 103 was analyzed by forensic chemists and tested positive for the presence of cocaine base, commonly known as "crack cocaine". The crack cocaine contained in Government Exhibit 103 weighed approximately .16 grams.

Your Honor, at this time the government would offer Government Exhibit 1000 which is the stipulation, as well as Government Exhibit 103 which is the item referenced in stipulation.

MR. LIND: I have no objection.

THE COURT: That'll be admitted into evidence.

```
Case 1:17-cr-00649-GBD Document 102 Filed 10/16/18 Page 76 of 221
      I9CAAPOL3
                                Prior - Direct
               (Government's Exhibit 103 AND 1000 received in
1
      evidence)
 2
 3
               MR. FOLLY:
                           Permission to approach, your Honor?
 4
               THE COURT:
                           Yes.
 5
               (Pause)
 6
               MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, can we publish this to the
 7
      jury?
               THE COURT: That's 103?
8
9
               MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor.
10
               THE COURT: Yes.
11
               (Pause)
12
          Detective Prior, do you recognize part of that exhibit?
13
      Α.
          Yes.
14
          What part do you recognize?
      Q.
15
      Α.
          The right side there's an undercover bag here that I used
      for the buy with JD Buddha.
16
17
          Can you read aloud the date listed there?
      Q.
18
          Sure. May 25, 2013.
      Α.
          And the name?
19
      Q.
20
      Α.
         JD Buddha.
21
          Can you also read aloud the location?
      Q.
22
      A. Front of 1055 University.
          Now, if you look at the other side of that exhibit, there
23
```

appears to be some items there, small plastic items.

24

25

recognize those?

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. What are they?
- 3 A. Twists of crack.
- 4 | Q. If you could show just the witness what's been marked as
- 5 Government Exhibit 103-A. Do you recognize that?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. How do you recognize it?
- 8 A. It's the twists of crack, a picture of this.
- 9 Q. It's a picture of the exhibit next to you there?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. Did you review that photograph before testifying today?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. Is it a fair and accurate photo of what's in the Government
- 14 | Exhibit 103?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, the government offers
- 17 Government Exhibit 103-A.
- 18 MR. LIND: No objection.
- 19 THE COURT: It'll be admitted into evidence.
- 20 (Government's Exhibit 103-A received in evidence)
- 21 Q. Detective Prior --
- 22 MR. FOLLY: Could we please publish that to the jury?
- 23 THE COURT: Yes.
- 24 | Q. And Detective Prior, when you were referring to the twists
- 25 of crack, using the touchscreen there could you circle those

I9CAAPOL3 Prior - Cross 1 for the jury. 2 (Pause) 3 MR. FOLLY: Thank you. You can take that down. 4 Detective Prior, after the date May 25, 2013, did you have 5 any additional interactions with Buddha? 6 Α. No. 7 MR. FOLLY: No further questions. THE COURT: Cross-examination? 8 9 MR. LIND: Just a few questions. 10 THE COURT: Sure. 11 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. LIND: 12 13 Good afternoon, detective. Ο. 14 Good afternoon. Α. 15 Q. Other than I guess, Buddha --16 Α. Yes. 17 That's the only person you bought drugs from on that occasion, correct? 18 19 Α. No. 20 Who else? Ο. 21 JD Gray. Α. 22 Other than those two gentlemen, no one else, correct? Q. 23 Α. No. I have nothing further. 24 MR. LIND:

THE COURT: Any further questions?

I9CAAPOL3 Patterson - Direct

1 MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, detective.

You can step down.

MR. FOLLY: The government calls Detective Patterson

at this time.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

SCOTT PATTERSON,

called as a witness by the Government,

having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. FOLLY:

- Q. Good afternoon, Detective Patterson?
- 12 A. Good afternoon.
- 13 | Q. Where do you work?
- 14 A. Night Watch NYPD.
- 15 | Q. What is your title there?
- 16 A. Detective.
- 17 | Q. How long have you been a detective at the NYPD?
- 18 A. Approximately, 15 years.
- 19 | Q. What are your responsibilities as a Night Watch detective?
- 20 | A. To respond to different type of crimes and investigations
- 21 | throughout the night hours of between 12 and eight a.m.
- 22 | Q. Directing your attention to July 25, 2015, were you
- 23 | involved in a NYPD investigation on that date?
- 24 | A. Yes, I was.

25

Q. What was the nature of the investigation?

- A. It was a male shot investigation.
- 2 Q. What steps did you take during the investigation?
- 3 A. Response to the hospital which was Bronx Lebanon Hospital
- 4 | in the Bronx, interviews of police officers, victims and
- 5 doctors.

- Q. Approximately, when did you arrive at the Bronx Lebanon
- 7 | Hospital?
- 8 A. Approximately, 0545 hours.
- 9 Q. What happened when you arrived at the hospital?
- 10 A. First thing when we arrived, I spoke to the officers who
- 11 were there prior to my arrival, got a story from them and spoke
- 12 | to the victim, spoke to the doctors and just continued the
- 13 | investigation at the hospital from there.
- 14 | Q. You mentioned that one of the things you did was speak to
- 15 | the victim. Where was the victim at the time that you spoke
- 16 | with him?
- 17 A. He was in one of the beds in the ER of the hospital.
- 18 | Q. Did you eventually view the victim's property?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. What type of property did the victim have?
- 21 A. It consisted of clothing, sneakers, keys, U.S. currency.
- 22 | Q. Was there anything else inside of the property?
- 23 A. Yes. In one of the sneakers, the right sneaker was two
- 24 bags of what I thought was, what I think is marijuana, large
- 25 bags and a knife.

- Case 1:17-cr-00649-GBD Document 102 Filed 10/16/18 Page 81 of 221 I9CAAPOL3 Patterson - Direct Can you explain for the jury why you believed that the item 1 in those bags was marijuana? 2 3 A. It was the way that it was packaged. It was a large bag 4 with smaller bags within the large bag. Also was a green leafy 5 substance. MR. FOLLY: If we could show the witness what's been 6 7 mark as Government Exhibits 511 and 512. 8 (Pause) 9 Α. Yes. 10 Ο. And that's 512? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. Do you recognize those?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 What are they? Q.
- Those are photos that I took of the property that I laid 15 Α. 16 out.
- 17 MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, the government offers Government Exhibits 511 and 512. 18
- 19 MR. LIND: No objection.
- 20 THE COURT: It'll be admitted into evidence.
- 21 (Government's Exhibits 511 and 512 received in
- 22 evidence)
- 23 Ο. When did you take --
- 24 MR. FOLLY: Can we please publish these to the jury? 25 (Pause)

MR. FOLLY: And 512. 1 2 (Pause) 3 When did you take these two photographs? 4 At the hospital when I went to the property. Α. 5 Q. You mentioned that one of the items you found in the 6 victim's property was marijuana. 7 MR. FOLLY: Can we go back to Government Exhibit 11. 8 (Pause) 9 Can you circle on screen which items you are referring to 10 as the marijuana? 11 Α. Sure. 12 (Pause) 13 MR. FOLLY: Let the record reflect the witness has 14 circled the two plastic bags that appear to be in the right 15 shoe in this photograph with the green leafy substance inside of them. 16 17 Q. Did you have any further involvement in this investigation 18 after July 25, 2015? 19 A. No. 20 MR. FOLLY: No further questions, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Any questions? 22 MR. LIND: I don't have any questions. 23 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You can step down. 24 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Krouse.

MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, at this time the government
would like to read a stipulation between the parties which is
marked as Government Exhibit 1003.
Your Honor, the parties stipulate that on July 13,
2015 Delisa Harris rented a 2015 Toyota Camry with Florida
license plate number 122PRA from an EZ Rental car location in
Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Ms. Harris provided the following
address 125B West 158 Street, Apartment Five, Bronx, New York
10452.
According to the New York Department of Motor
Vehicles, the DMV, Government Exhibit 7 is a DMV photograph of
Delisa Harris who lives at 125B West 168 Street, Apartment 5A,
Bronx, New York 10452.
On August 7, 2015, the Toyota Camry with Florida
license plate number 12PRA was found in the Bronx and seized by
New York City Police Department.
The government offers Government Exhibit 1003.
THE COURT: Any objections?
MR. LIND: No.
THE COURT: It'll be admitted into evidence.
MR. KROUSE: The government also offers Government
Exhibit 7B which is the nameplate "Delisa Harris".
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. LIND: No.
THE COURT TILLING IN THE TILLING

THE COURT: It'll be admitted into evidence.

(Government's Exhibits 1003 and 7B received in 1 evidence) 2 3 MR. KROUSE: The government calls Detective Kegham 4 Jarjokian. 5 KEGHAM JARJOKIAN, 6 called as a witness by the Government, 7 having been duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 9 BY MR. KROUSE: 10 Good afternoon, Officer Jarjokian. Good afternoon. 11 Α. Officer Jarjokian, where do you currently work? 12 13 Α. Patrol Bureau Bronx Evidence Collection Unit. 14 Is that part of the New York Police Department? Q. Yes, it is. 15 Α. What is your title with the evidence collection unit? 16 0. 17 Police officer. Α. 18 How long have you been with the NYPD? 19 Eighteen years. Α. 20 How long have you been with the evidence collection unit? 0. 21 Thirteen years. Α. 22 What are your duties and responsibilities as an officer with the evidence collection unit? 23 24 We respond to all felony crimes to assist detectives with

their investigation through forensic fingerprinting and DNA

I9CAAPOL3

Jarjokian - Direct

- 1 | photography.
- 2 | Q. "Photography" what does that mean?
- $3 \parallel A.$ Photos.
- 4 | Q. Taking photos?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. You also recover any evidence that's at the scene?
- 7 \blacksquare A. We do, yes.
- 8 Q. Do you recall responding to an incident on August 4, 2015?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | 0. What sort of incident?
- 11 | A. It was two males shot.
- 12 | Q. Where were those two men shot?
- 13 A. The address is --
- 14 | Q. Just without reading from anything what in general where
- 15 were the two men shot?
- 16 A. It was in a store.
- 17 | Q. And do you recall where geographically it was?
- 18 A. Anderson Avenue.
- 19 Q. And is that in the Bronx?
- 20 A. In the Bronx.
- 21 MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you place on the
- 22 | screen what's been admitted into evidence as Government Exhibit
- 23 | 201.
- 24 | Q. Officer Jarjokian, do you see 950 Anderson Avenue marked on
- 25 | this map?

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. Is that where the store was located that you responded to?
- 3 | A. Yes.
- 4 MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you place on the screen Government Exhibit 535.
- 6 (Pause)
- 7 Q. Officer Jarjokian, do you recognize this photograph?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 \parallel Q. What is it?
- 10 A. This is a photo that I took of the intersection West 162
- 11 | and Anderson Avenue where the store was.
- 12 | Q. Do you see the store located at 950 Anderson in this
- 13 | photograph?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 \parallel Q. Where is it?
- 16 A. It's on the right-hand side, tobacco shop.
- MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you place on the
- 18 screen Government Exhibit 534. And is this just a different
- 19 angle of the same area?
- 20 A. Yes. The front of the location.
- 21 | Q. Do you see the tobacco shop in this photograph?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. Where is it in the photo?
- 24 A. On the left hand side.
- 25 | Q. Officer Jarjokian, you mentioned that you responded to a

- shooting that occurred at 950 Anderson Avenue on August 4,
- 2 | 2015, correct?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. What was your understanding of how many people had been
- 5 shot?
- 6 | A. Two.
- 7 Q. When you got to the scene of the incident were the victims
- 8 of the shootings still there?
- 9 | A. No.
- 10 | Q. Were you able to determine where in the store the victims
- 11 | had been shot?
- 12 | A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Where had they been shot?
- 14 A. In the back room, the rear of the location.
- 15 | Q. And can you generally describe the layout of the store for
- 16 | the jury?
- 17 | A. It's a grocery store, also tobacco products that leads to
- 18 | the hallway at the back with another room in the back that's
- 19 | for stocking.
- 20 | Q. When you say "for stocking" what do you mean by that?
- 21 A. Supplies to restock the shelves, like an office/stock room.
- 22 | Q. Is there anything else in that back room?
- 23 A. A bathroom.
- MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you place on the
- 25 screen for just the witness what has been marked --

Ja	rio	kian	– D	irect
Ou		112 411		TT CC

1	Actually your Honor may I approach the withous?
1	Actually, your Honor, may I approach the witness?
2	THE COURT: Yes.
3	Q. Officer Jarjokian, I am handing you a stack of photographs
4	marked Government Exhibit 501 through 510. Could you flip
5	through those photographs and then look up when you're done.
6	(Pause)
7	Q. Officer Jarjokian, do you recognize the photographs of
8	Government Exhibit 501 to 510?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. How do you recognize them?
11	A. The photos that I took of the crime scene.
12	Q. Are those the photos you took on August 4, 2015 when you
13	responded to 950 Anderson Avenue?
14	A. Yes.
15	MR. KROUSE: The government offers Government Exhibit
16	501 through 510 and all the exhibits in between.
17	THE COURT: Any objection?
18	MR. LIND: No.
19	THE COURT: They'll be admitted into evidence.
20	(Government's Exhibits 501 - 510 received in evidence)
21	MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, may we publish those
22	exhibits to the jury?
23	THE COURT: Yes.
24	MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, could you place on the
25	screen for everyone what's been admitted into evidence as

- 1 Government Exhibit 501.
- 2 (Pause)
- 3 Q. Now, Officer Jarjokian, can you describe what this
- 4 | photograph depicts?
- 5 A. This is a picture from leaning into the back storage room
- 6 for the outside looking in.
- 7 | Q. Where were you saning when you took the photograph?
 - A. In the store facing the back room.
- 9 Q. And then through that open door is the back room?
- 10 | A. Yes.

- MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you put on the screen
- 12 | what's been admitted as Government Exhibit 504.
- 13 (Pause)
- Q. Officer Jarjokian, where were you standing when you took
- 15 | this photograph?
- 16 A. I'm in the back room you but in the corner.
- 17 | Q. And directing your attention to the door frame that's on
- 18 | the right toward the right of the photograph when you are
- 19 | facing it -- it's little bit ajar. What's that door frame lead
- 20 | to or door lead to?
- 21 A. The right side is the bathroom and to my left is the
- 22 entrance door to the back room.
- 23 | Q. The door on the left of the photograph is the entrance from
- 24 | the store into the back room?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. And you said that the door on the right, that's to the bathroom?
- 3 | A. Yes.
- Q. And Officer Jarjokian, it may be obvious but what is the red stuff that's on the floor and on the walls in this
- 6 | photograph?
- 7 A. Blood.

8

- MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you put on the screen what's been admitted as Government Exhibit 502.
- 10 (Pause)
- 11 Q. Officer Jarjokian, what does this photograph depict?
- 12 A. We call it a BIM, ballistics impact marking, which shows
- 13 where the projectile hit the actual surface.
- 14 Q. And when you say "the projectile" what do you mean by that?
- 15 A. The bullet.
- 16 0. So is this a bullet hole?
- 17 | A. A bullet hole, correct.
- 18 Q. And what is this door that's being depicted in this
- 19 | photograph?
- 20 A. That's the door that separates the main to the back room,
- 21 | the entrance.
- 22 | Q. The main store from the back room?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. In addition to taking photographs, did you also recover
- 25 | items of evidence for the scene of the shooting?

1 A. Yes, I did.

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 2 | Q. What did you recover?
- 3 A. Five deformed bullets.
- Q. And what, if anything, did you do to mark where those five deformed bullets were when you found them?
 - A. I put down numbered markers.

MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, could you put on the screen Government Exhibit 507.

(Pause)

- Q. Officer Jarjokian, what does this photographer show?
- 11 A. Marker number one and on the floor next to it is a deformed bullet.
- Q. Could you circle what the deformed bullet is on the screen.

14 (Pause)

MR. KROUSE: Let the record reflect that the witness has circled towards the center of the photograph a gray item on the floor next to the cup that says "one".

Officer Jarjokian, can you press clear on that screen.

(Pause)

MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you put on the screen Government Exhibit 508.

(Pause)

- 23 | Q. Officer Jarjokian, what does that photograph show?
- A. Marker number two with a deformed bullet on the floor next to it.

Ja	rjo:	kian	- :	Dire	ct

	19CAAPOL3 Jarjokian - Direct
1	Q. Can you circle on your screen the deformed bullet.
2	(Pause)
3	MR. KROUSE: Let the record reflect the witness has
4	circled an item located in the middle and toward the bottom of
5	the photograph.
6	Officer Jarjokian, can you press clear again.
7	Mr. Concepcion, can you put on the screen Government
8	Exhibit 509.
9	(Pause)
10	Q. Officer Jarjokian, what does this photograph show?
11	A. Marker number three with the deformed bullet.
12	Q. And could you again circle the deformed bullet in this
13	photograph?
14	MR. KROUSE: And again, let the record reflect that
15	Officer Jarjokian has circled an item in the middle of the
16	photograph next to the cup that says "three".
17	Can you clear the screen again. Thank you.
18	Mr. Concepcion, can you put on screen Government
19	Exhibit 510.
20	Q. Officer Jarjokian, what does that photograph show?
21	A. It's markers numbered "four" and "five" with two deformed
22	bullets.
23	MR. KROUSE: Can you circle the two deformed bullets

in this photograph.

(Pause)

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Jarjokian - Direct

- MR. KROUSE: Let the record reflect the witness has circled two items towards the left of the photograph next to the cups that say "five" or "four".
 - Q. Officer Jarjokian, did you also take a photograph that shows where in the back room all of those five deformed bullets were recovered?
 - A. Yes.

MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you put on the screen Government Exhibit 506.

(Pause)

- Q. What does this photograph show?
- 12 A. It's and overall view standing outside looking into the 13 back room where everything was prior to collection.
- Q. And these, "where everything was" you mean the numbered cups show where the deformed bullets were?
- 16 A. Correct.
- Q. Before you took this photograph had you moved any of the deformed bullets that were recovered for the scene?
- 19 A. They were not moved.
- 20 Q. After you took this photograph did you pick up the deformed 21 bullets?
- 22 | A. Yes, I did.
- 23 | Q. What, if anything, did you do with them?
- A. I packaged them and then I did a voucher with a request for lab.

- 1 | Q. And by "voucher" what does that mean?
- 2 A. Voucher is an, we itemize exactly what is being collected.
- 3 It has pedigree information, my information, the location and
- 4 basically everything that I am going to be sending in.
- 5 MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?
- 6 THE COURT: Yes.
- 7 MR. KROUSE: I am handing the witness what has been
- 8 marked as Government Exhibit 104 for identification.
- 9 Q. Officer Jarjokian, do you recognize this exhibit?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 \square Q. What is it?
- 12 A. These are the five deformed bullets that was collected.
- 13 | Q. Were you shown this exhibit before you were called to
- 14 | testify today?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. Did you review the voucher paperwork associated with these
- 17 | five bullet fragments?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 | Q. And did you identify this exhibit as the bullet fragments
- 20 | that you found on August 4, 2015 inside 950 Anderson Avenue?
- 21 | A. Yes, I did.
- 22 | Q. Did you initial the exhibit sticker?
- 23 A. Yes, I did?
- MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, the government offers
- 25 Government Exhibit 104.

I9CAAPOL3 Jarjokian - Direct 1 MR. LIND: Just have one moment, judge? THE COURT: Yes. 2 3 (Pause) 4 MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, may I approach the witness? 5 THE COURT: Yes. 6 MR. KROUSE: The government is retrieving Government 7 Exhibit 104 for the witness and handing it to defense counsel for examination. 8 9 (Pause) 10 MR. LIND: Just one question? 11 THE COURT: Yes. VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. LIND: 14 Your initials are where on this? Q.

- 13
- 15 On the yellow it says "KJ". Α.
- And then your initials appear anywhere else on this form? 16 0.
- 17 Just on the package. Α.
- 18 There are two initials, is it this one over here? It has a
- May date? 19
- 20 What does it say? Α.
- 21 May of 2015, is that the date? Q.
- 22 Α. No. I did the yellow sticker.
- 23 (Pause)
- 24 Do you know whose initials there are on this?
- 25 I put my initials "KJ". Α.

- 1 Q. On the exhibit yourself?
- 2 A. I don't know. Unless it's KJ, it's not me.
- 3 Q. OK. So what did you do after you -- you put the bullets in
- 4 | the package?
- 5 A. In a separate package prior to this, yeah.
- 6 Q. OK. And then it went in this?
- 7 A. Then it was put into that.
- 8 Q. Then what happened after that?
- 9 A. I put it in different packaging and it's sent to the lab
- 10 differently than what you have in your hand. That's not my
- 11 case.
- 12 | Q. OK. So then what's this? After it had gone to the lab?
- 13 A. I guess when lab does their analysis and they send it back
- 14 | that's how they package it. I package it differently than when
- 15 | it comes back.
- 16 MR. LIND: There's a chain of custody issue here,
- 17 | judge. I don't know --
- 18 Q. Did you look at the bullets when they came back?
- 19 A. When I looked for -- yes, we looked at it, yes.
- 20 Q. When they came back from the lab.
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. OK. And were they the same bullets that were sent there?
- 23 A. The same bullets, yes.
- 24 MR. LIND: I have no objection.
- 25 THE COURT: Then it will be admitted in evidence.

- 1 (Government's Exhibit 104 received in evidence)
- 2 MR. KROUSE: May I approach the witness?
- THE COURT: Yes.
- 4 (Pause)
- 5 BY MR. KROUSE:
- Q. The government's handling the witness what's been admitted in into evidence as Government Exhibit 104.
 - Officer Jarjokian, do you see on the back of that package voucher paperwork?
- 10 | A. Yes.

8

- 11 | Q. And what's on that paperwork? What's reflected on that?
- 12 A. It's the five items that were submitted, unknown caliber,
- 13 only information that belongs with that.
- 14 | Q. Who does that show vouchered that evidence?
- 15 A. Myself.
- 16 | Q. So your name is on that voucher paperwork?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. Your identifying information is also on that paperwork?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Officer Jarjokian, could you take out of the exhibit the
- 21 | items that are stored within it, namely, the bullets. How many
- 22 | bullets are in that package?
- 23 | A. Five.
- 24 | Q. Do you recognize those deformed bullets? Are they the
- 25 deformed bullets that you recovered from the scene on

1 | August 34, 12015 within 950 Anderson avenue?

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, could we put on the screen just for the witness -- excuse me.

Mr. Concepcion, Government Exhibit 539.

(Pause)

- Q. Officer Jarjokian, do you see that photograph?
- 8 | A. Yes.
 - Q. What does it depict?
 - A. The five deformed bullets that was collected.
- 11 | Q. Looking at photograph and looking at the five deformed
- 12 | bullets that you have in front of you, are they the identical
- 13 | five deformed bullets?
- 14 A. Yes.
- MR. KROUSE: The government offers Government Exhibit

 16 539.
- 17 MR. LIND: No objection.
- 18 THE COURT: It'll be admitted into evidence.
- 19 (Government's Exhibit 539 received in evidence)
- 20 MR. KROUSE: May we publish the exhibit, your Honor?
- 21 THE COURT: Yes.
- 22 (Pause)
- 23 MR. KROUSE: Then may we publish the physical exhibit
- 24 | as well, your Honor?
- 25 | THE COURT: Yes. How do you want to do that?

9CAAPOL3	Jarjokian –	Direct

1	MR. KROUSE: I'll approach the witness, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: OK.
3	MR. KROUSE: The government's approaching the witness
4	stand and is collecting the five deformed bullets and the
5	envelope itself and publishing it the jury.
6	(Pause)
7	MR. KROUSE: No further questions, your Honor.
8	MR. LIND: I have no questions, your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You can step down.
10	Mr. Krouse, how long is your next witness?
11	MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, approximately 20 to 25
12	minutes.
13	THE COURT: OK. Do we have much more after that?
14	MR. KROUSE: No, your Honor. There are three more
15	witnesses I believe.
16	THE COURT: Oh, you do have three more witnesses?
17	MR. KROUSE: Including this one.
18	THE COURT: All right. So can we take about ten
19	minutes and then we'll take a lunch break. Go ten minutes with
20	that witness.
21	MR. KROUSE: Yes, your Honor.
22	THE COURT: And we're still on schedule. Why don't we
23	do this. Let's take the lunch break. I'm going to ask you to
24	be back like 2:10. I believe there's a possibility we may
25	finish the witnesses today. So if we can, then I will give you

```
1
      the case tomorrow. So I want to start promptly at 2:10 and see
      how far we get this afternoon.
 2
 3
               MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, the only thing is the
 4
      exhibits are still with the jury.
 5
               THE COURT: We can wait till then.
6
               (Pause)
 7
               THE COURT: You should know any exhibits you want to
8
      review in the jury room, just give us a note and I'll send it
9
      in.
10
               (Pause)
                           OK. Ladies and gentlemen, I'll see you at
11
               THE COURT:
12
      2:10.
            We'll continue promptly at that time.
13
               (Jury not present)
14
               THE COURT: Mr. Krouse, you have three more witnesses.
      Do you think we'll finish them this afternoon?
15
16
               MR. KROUSE: Yes, your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: I am going to give both sides what I am
18
      working on as jury instructions and the verdict form. There
      are some things that I left out that I thought were
19
20
      unnecessary, literally. I just thought the instructions were
21
      too long and too complicated for what is a simpler case.
22
               So look and make sure that if there's something
23
     missing that you think is important, let me know if there is
24
      something if there that you think we don't need and
25
      specifically, look over the verdict form. I think it's
```

consistent with the way the evidence has been presented and the way the parties were arguing it. But after both sides rest we'll go through it this afternoon and then we'll continue with the charging conference in the morning. What I'll probably do if we are going to sum up tomorrow is have us come back at 9:30 and have the jury come back at 9:45 so we can finalize the jury instructions and begin summations at 9:45. So I'll see everyone at 2:10. (Luncheon Recess) (Continued on next page)

```
1
               (In open court; jury not present)
 2
               MR. LIND: Judge, I have a brief legal question.
 3
               THE COURT: Sure.
 4
               MR. LIND: I've raised it with the government.
 5
               I'd like to be able to have either the expert or
6
      myself read into evidence excerpts from a study by The National
 7
      Academy of Sciences regarding forensic science and, in
     particular, an excerpt relating to ballistics and toolmarks
8
9
      tests and validity. An identical portion of this article was
10
      admitted in the Gil case. That was one of the cases that was
11
      cited on appeal. Judge Koeltl admitted it as a learned
12
      treatise.
13
               In fact, the witness in that case was Detective Fox,
14
      who recognized it as authoritative.
15
               THE COURT: That's who is testifying here?
16
               MR. LIND: Yes.
17
               So I can show you, your Honor --
18
               THE COURT: Well, let me figure out whether there's
19
      some disagreement, and then I'll resolve the dispute.
20
               MR. LIND: I can tell you there is.
21
               THE COURT: So you want do what with it?
22
               MR. LIND:
                          I want him or I can read it into evidence.
23
               THE COURT: Read how much of it?
24
               MR. LIND: Very little. Just like two paragraphs.
25
               THE COURT: All right.
```

I9CKPOL4

25

1 And let me see it. 2 I'll bring up a copy, Judge. MR. LIND: 3 THE COURT: What's the government's position? 4 MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, our position is if Mr. Lind 5 were to lay the proper foundation on cross-examination and 6 satisfy these requirements under Rule 803(18)(A) and (B), that 7 it might be appropriate at that time to only read it, but not admit it as an exhibit. 8 9 MR. LIND: That's what I was saying. 10 THE COURT: Which paragraphs? 11 MR. LIND: Let me go to them, Judge. Just one second, 12 Judge? 13 (Pause) 14 THE COURT: In the abstract, I have no problems with 15 you -- if they're proffering him as an expert, with you asking 16 if he's aware of a certain treatise and he's aware of certain 17 conclusions that are reached in that treatise by the person who wrote that treat. That seems to be fair game with experts. 18 19 You can ask whether he agrees or disagrees with that. I'm not 20 quite sure what -- again, because you're springing it on me, 21 I'm not quite sure what is the substance of what you want to 22 put in. 23 There are two paragraphs, Judge. MR. LIND: 24

trying to slow this down.

THE COURT: What page are you on?

```
1
               MR. LIND: Let me see. There are two excerpts.
      One -- the second one is on toolmarks, it's on page 154.
 2
 3
      you see the numbers are in the upper --
 4
               THE COURT: Yes. 154, I have it.
 5
               MR. LIND: So it says, "Toolmark and firearms analysis
      suffers from the same limitations discussed above for
6
 7
      impression evidence because not enough" -- well, it's that
8
     paragraph, Judge.
9
               THE COURT: Okay. Let me read it.
10
               Okay. What's the second part?
11
               MR. LIND:
                          The second one is the next page, Judge,
12
      beginning with "Although."
13
               THE COURT: Okay. How long a treatise is this?
14
               MR. LIND: It's at least 155 pages. I think it's
15
     probably like 500 pages, Judge.
               THE COURT: Oh.
16
                              Okav.
17
               And you want --
18
               MR. LIND: Either the expert or I can read it into
19
      evidence. Under the rule, it cannot be admitted into evidence,
20
      the particular exhibit.
21
               THE COURT: The substance of what you want is the
22
     portion -- two of the three paragraphs under "Summary
23
     Assessment"?
24
               MR. LIND:
                          That's correct, Judge.
25
               THE COURT: The first one and the second or the first
```

```
1
      one and the bottom?
               MR. LIND: And the last one beginning with "Although"
 2
 3
      on page 155.
 4
               THE COURT: What do you want to ask him about it?
 5
               MR. LIND: Well, is he aware that there's a deficiency
      in toolmark analysis?
6
 7
               THE COURT: Okay.
               MR. LIND: Because a lot of it, which he agreed to in
8
9
     his testimony before Judge Koeltl, that --
10
               THE COURT: Was this put before him in his testimony
11
     before Judge Koeltl?
12
               MR. LIND: Yes. I have it right here. If your
13
      Honor -- I can bring it up.
14
               THE COURT: Well, just summarize for me what happened
      in front of Judge Koeltl, if that's what you want to similarly
15
16
      do.
17
               MR. LIND: Well, I think the defense attorney in that
      case asked if he could read it, you know, that he wants to
18
19
     present this --
20
               THE COURT: Okay.
21
               MR. LIND: -- as a learned treatise, and the judge
22
      recognized it.
23
               THE COURT: Okay. All right.
24
               So he's acknowledged -- in the past, he's acknowledged
```

that this is a learned treatise?

I9CKPOL4

1 MR. LIND: Right. THE COURT: That he's aware of? 2 3 MR. LIND: Yes. 4 THE COURT: And you want to ask him about whether or 5 not -- you want to ask him what conclusions or determinations were made in that treatise? 6 7 MR. LIND: Yes. 8 THE COURT: Are you going to ask him whether he agrees 9 or doesn't agree with that? MR. LIND: Yes, or both. 10 11 THE COURT: In the abstract, I don't have a problem 12 with it. It just depends on what form you want to do it in and 13 what makes the most sense in the most efficient and the fast 14 way of presenting it to him. I don't know if he is going to 15 say, yeah, I agree with that, but there's another portion that 16 says X. 17 If he says that -- or he may say -- in the MR. LIND: case in front of Judge Koeltl, which was three years ago, he 18 basically just read it, and he didn't have much of a 19 20 disagreement. 21 THE COURT: Anybody ask him anything about it? 22 MR. LIND: Yes. I mean, the defense attorney asked 23 him about it. 24 THE COURT: He didn't ask him whether he agreed with 25 it or disagreed with it?

MR. LIND: Well, I'll tell you -- I'm sorry, Judge.

Let me just get back to my --

THE COURT: Look, I'll turn to the government and see how violently they object to this, but I don't have any problem with you putting before him or putting before the jury page 154 and 155 and asking him whatever you want to ask him about it, about those conclusions. And if there is some other portion that he thinks is relevant that he wants to identify, and he and the government can identify some other portion and put that before the jury.

MR. LIND: Well, in the other case, before even looking at it, he says, well, to go back to this report that we are talking about in 2008, NHH's chairman, Dr. Raul, actually wrote an affidavit saying that this report has nothing to do with firearms identification based on toolmarks. That's what his response was to that.

THE COURT: That was this witness' response?

MR. LIND: Yes.

THE COURT: So he thinks it doesn't change -- he disagrees with it?

MR. LIND: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. So that's fine. I'm just trying to figure out what the government doesn't want you to do. That's what I'm trying to figure out.

MR. LIND: I think it's anything I want to do, Judge.

I9CKPOL4

THE COURT: What and why is usually what I ask.

What do you want me to limit him to, or do you want

3 him to go to his heart's content?

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, the government's only concern is whether or not this is established as a reliable authority through this witness. We've never seen this before, so --

THE COURT: Only the witness can tell us -- your witness can tell us whether or not this is a reliable authority that he's consulted, he's aware of. I assume he's given that kind of testimony in the past, that he's aware of it, he's consulted with it, he's an expert, and this other guy is an expert. Whether or not he agrees with -- they agree on everything is a different question. The question here is whether or not -- I mean, Mr. Lind, are you challenging him as an expert?

MR. LIND: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you challenging the reliability of his methodology, or are you just challenging the sufficiency of his conclusion?

MR. LIND: No. What I'm challenging, Judge, is that -- like I think this report also says the same thing, that there's a spectrum here.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. LIND: DNA is one end of the spectrum, toolmarks and fingerprints analysis are on the other end of the spectrum.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LIND: That is not as reliable as DNA analysis or like blood analysis.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. LIND: So because there are different parts of his toolmark ballistics --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. LIND: -- but the final -- I think there's class characterizations, and then there are more specific, and the second category of itemizing or identifying certain things is a subjective analysis.

THE COURT: Okay.

Before I get back to them: You put this issue in a different context now than when we started, because now the question is -- you say that you didn't want him to testify about the certainty of his conclusion. If you're going to challenge whether or not this science is as good a science as some other science, then you may be opening the door to whether or not, based on his experience and expertise, whether he is confident in his conclusion here that this bullet came from this gun.

MR. LIND: Well, your Honor, I can't tell that until I hear the direct testimony. At that point, I'll raise this again with your Honor.

THE COURT: Right. But I can't limit him in that

regard, if that's the challenge, about whether or not the science that he's using, that he should be less confident of those conclusions.

MR. LIND: No, I don't think that's where it is. What he did in the other case, Judge, also, is that he recognized that part of the analysis is subjective.

THE COURT: Right, okay.

MR. LIND: That's all I really want to get to here.

THE COURT: As I say -- let me put it to you this way:

Clearly, I don't know -- and the government can tell me

otherwise -- I don't know of any restriction that I can put on
you with regard to the type of questions you ask him about his
experience, his analysis, whether or not his science, whether
or not he knows of other people in the field who are experts,
whether he's read certain treatises, whether he's read certain
portions of treatises, and whether he agrees with that portion
or disagrees with that portion. That avenue of inquiry, I
think, is perfectly appropriate for any expert.

As you see, if you look at the proposed jury instructions, I'm going to give the jury the standard instruction on expert witnesses and tell them that, look, you listen to the guy, and you make up your own mind whether or not that makes sense, is basically what the instructions say.

So with regard to your wanting to inquire about a treatise that he's aware of and whether he's aware of what that

treatise says, anything in particular, whether he agrees with it or disagrees with it, I don't think that there is, in the abstract, a basis for me to say you can't inquire in that way.

Does the government think I should restrict him with regard to that inquiry?

MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

So then the question really is: What do you want to do with the piece of paper? And whether the government is going to object to you putting in some or all -- because I don't know what he is going to say when you ask him about page 154. He may respond: Yeah, 154 says that, but if you go back to page 57, it says a different thing. So I don't know whether or not each side is going to want parts of the treatise, all of the treatise, none of the treatise, depending on what he has to say.

So you tell me: What is the manner in which you want to proceed?

MR. LIND: Well, I guess I'll wait for the expert's testimony, and then I can decide, Judge, and then maybe we can take like a two-minute break at the sidebar, and I can tell you what I want to do.

THE COURT: I guess the question really remains whether or not you're going to offer something as an exhibit, a portion of this as an exhibit.

MR. LIND: The rule says it doesn't come in as an exhibit. It's just something that's read.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LIND: That's what it says in the rule.

THE COURT: Yes. And I understand that, and I don't know what Judge Koeltl did in his case, but I have a lot of respect for Judge Koeltl, I'm sure he did it the right way.

Look, you always have the right to ask the expert -to quote something to the expert and ask the expert is he aware
of that, and does he agree with it.

MR. LIND: Right.

THE COURT: Now, how much of it -- I mean, we don't want to sit here and have you read for 20 minutes out of the thing.

MR. LIND: No, Judge. I'll show you the two paragraphs I want to do. I think it would take five minutes, at most.

In the other case, like your Honor -- I wanted to obviously bring this up before cross-examination, so we didn't have to spend all that time with the jury here, but I want to hear what he has to say.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LIND: And then my point, Judge -- and I think

I've said this a couple of times -- is just to sort of

emphasizing that this is a subjective analysis rather than --

```
he may -- I don't think --
```

THE COURT: He may come right out and tell you that right away, concede that. Let's take it step by step, hear what he has to say, and see what your inquiry is, and then see if the government has either an objection to your questions or to admission of some portion of this as an exhibit, and we can deal with it as it comes in, okay? But I'm not going — at this point right now, I'm not going to restrict you in the way you want to proceed. Proceed the way you want, and if the government has an objection, then I'll see if it's appropriate for me to stop you.

MR. LIND: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: So let's bring the jury in.

Do you have anything else?

MR. KROUSE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's bring the jury in, and let's continue.

And the government believes it has three more witnesses?

MR. KROUSE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You can get your witness.

MR. KROUSE: We have a stipulation first, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. He can sit in the audience.

(Continued on the next page)

```
1
               (Jury present)
               THE COURT: Mr. Krouse?
 2
 3
               MR. KROUSE: Thank you, your Honor.
 4
               Your Honor, at this time, the government would like to
5
      read a stipulation between the parties, Government Exhibit
      1007.
6
 7
               Just starting with Terrell, Mr. Concepcion.
               "The parties stipulate that Terrell Polk, the
8
9
      defendant, resided at 1145 University Avenue, Apartment 4-A, in
10
      the Bronx, New York, from March 18, 2014, until August 26,
      2015, and from December 13, 2016, until February 3, 2017."
11
12
               The government offers Government Exhibit 1007.
13
               MR. LIND: No objection.
14
               THE COURT: It will be admitted into evidence.
15
               (Government's Exhibit 1007 received in evidence)
               MR. KROUSE: The government also has another
16
17
      stipulation between the parties. This is Government Exhibit
18
      1006.
               "The parties stipulate that on January" --
19
20
               MR. LIND: I think that's wrong.
21
               MR. KROUSE: That's a typo. It should be July 25th,
22
      excuse me, your Honor. I'll correct the version that will be
23
      an exhibit.
24
               -- "that On July 25, 2015, New York City Police
25
      Department NYPD officers recovered three .40 caliber shell
```

casings from the sidewalk and street in front of 1055
University Avenue in the Bronx, New York. The three .40
caliber shell casings were invoiced by the NYPD under the
invoice number 200451574 and are marked as Government Exhibits
102-A, 102-B, and 102-C.

"Government Exhibit 533 is a true and accurate photograph of Government Exhibits 102-A, 102-B, and 102-C.

"Government Exhibit 102-A is a .40 caliber Smith & Wesson cartridge casing manufactured by Sellier & Bellot.

Government Exhibit 102-A was manufactured outside the State of New York.

"Government Exhibit 102-B is a .40 caliber Smith & Wesson cartridge casing manufactured by Wolf. Government Exhibit 102-B was manufactured outside the State of New York.

"Government Exhibit 102-C is a .40 caliber Smith & Wesson cartridge casing manufactured by Remington Peters.

Government Exhibit 102-C was manufactured outside the State of New York."

Your Honor, the government offers the stipulation, as corrected with the correct date on page 1, Government Exhibit 1006.

MR. LIND: No objection.

THE COURT: Then that will be admitted as corrected.

(Government's Exhibit 1006 received in evidence)

MR. KROUSE: The government also offers Government

```
Exhibit 102-A, 102-B, and 102-C, which are the shell casings
1
      themselves, your Honor.
 2
 3
               MR. LIND: Do you have them?
 4
               MR. KROUSE: Yes.
 5
               MR. LIND: No objection.
               THE COURT: It will be admitted into evidence.
 6
 7
               (Government's Exhibits 102-A, 102-B, and 102-C
      received in evidence)
8
9
               MR. KROUSE: The government also offers Government
      Exhibit 533, which is a photograph of the three shell casings.
10
11
               THE COURT: Any objection?
12
               MR. LIND: I just want to see it, Judge.
13
               THE COURT: Oh, okay.
14
               MR. KROUSE: Can you put it on the screen,
     Mr. Concepcion, for the parties?
15
               MR. LIND: I have no objection.
16
17
               THE COURT: They will be admitted into evidence.
               (Government's Exhibit 533 received in evidence)
18
19
               MR. KROUSE: The government also offers, on
20
      stipulation between the parties, photographs taken on July 25,
21
      2015, in front of and around 1055 University Avenue in the
22
              They are marked Government Exhibit 513, Government
23
      Exhibit 514, Government Exhibit 515, and Government Exhibit
24
      516, Government Exhibit 517, Government Exhibit 518, and
25
      Government Exhibit 519.
```

```
1
               MR. LIND: May I take a look?
               One second, Judge?
 2
 3
               THE COURT: Sure.
 4
               (Pause)
 5
               MR. LIND: No objection.
 6
               THE COURT: They will be admitted into evidence.
 7
               (Government's Exhibits 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518,
      and 519 received in evidence)
8
9
               MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, we may publish first
10
      Government Exhibit 533 for the jury?
11
               THE COURT: Yes.
12
               MR. KROUSE: And then may I publish Government
13
      Exhibits 102-A, B, and C, which are in the evidence bag, by
14
      handing it to Juror No. 1?
15
               THE COURT: Yes.
               MR. KROUSE: Thank you, your Honor.
16
17
               Your Honor, may the government also publish the
18
      photographs that have been admitted from the scene at 1055
      University Avenue on July 25, 2015?
19
20
               THE COURT: Yes.
21
               MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you put on the screen
      for everyone Government Exhibit 513.
22
23
               Now Exhibit Government Exhibit 514.
24
               Government Exhibit 515.
25
               Government Exhibit 516.
```

Case 1:17-cr-00649-GBD Document 102 Filed 10/16/18 Page 118 of 221 I9CKPOL4 Fox - Direct Government Exhibit 517. 1 Government Exhibit 518. 2 3 And Government Exhibit 519. 4 Thank you, your Honor. 5 MR. FOLLY: At this time, the government calls Detective Jonathan Fox. 6 7 JONATHAN FOX, called as a witness by the Government, 8 9 having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 10 THE LAW CLERK: Please state and spell your name for 11 the record. 12 THE WITNESS: Detective Jonathan, J-o-n-a-t-h-a-n, Fox 13 F-o-x, Shield 443, of the New York City Police Department. 14 THE COURT: You can be seated. 15 THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. FOLLY: May I proceed, your Honor? 16 17 THE COURT: Yes, sir. DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. FOLLY: 19 20 Good afternoon, Detective Fox. 21 Α. Good afternoon. 22 Q. Where do you work?

- 23 I work at the police laboratory, specifically the firearms
- 24 analysis section, of the New York City Police Department.
- 25 How long have you been with the NYPD?

Fox - Direct

- 1 A. Twenty years.
- 2 | Q. What rank are you?
- 3 A. I'm a detective.
- 4 | Q. How long have you been a detective?
- 5 | A. Since 2006.
- 6 Q. How long have you been in the firearms analysis section?
- 7 A. Since 2004.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. What are your duties and responsibilities in the firearms analysis section?
- 10 A. We test firearms and ammunition for operability. We also
 11 microscopically examine ballistic evidence, such as cartridge
 12 casings, bullets, and bullet fragments.
 - Q. When you say cartridge casings, bullet fragments, bullets, shell casings, what do you mean by those terms?
 - A. Those are projectiles or those are pieces of evidence that are actually fired out of a firearm.

Essentially, there's four components to a cartridge.

There's the cartridge casing, the primer, inside the cartridge casing is the gunpowder propellent, and then the bullet. A cartridge is fired out of a firearm, and when certain pieces of that cartridge come in contact with the firearm, they leave marks on that cartridge casing or bullet, and we examine those pieces to determine if they were fired from one firearm or multiple firearms.

Q. Where does a casing go when it is fired from a gun?

I9CKPOL4 Fox - Direct

A. If you fire a cartridge out of a semiautomatic handgun, the semiautomatic handgun, when it's done firing, the cartridge is designed to eject the cartridge casing from the particular firearm. So in a cartridge casing, which is loaded through a magazine, the magazine is placed in the firearm, you pull the slide rearward. When the slide goes forward, a cartridge from the top of the magazine will be placed in the chamber. When you press the trigger of a semiautomatic handgun, a firing pin strikes the back of the cartridge casing, hitting the primer. When the primer is struck, it causes a spark. That spark ignites the gunpowder propellant. When gunpowder is lit, it turns into a gas. When the gas builds up enough pressure, it forces the bullet out of the firearm.

After that process, everything has an equal and opposite reaction. The slide comes rearward on the semiautomatic handgun. There's a hook that they call an extractor on the slide that pulls the cartridge out of the chamber of the firearm and ejects if from the semiautomatic handgun. They call that a cycle fire.

Q. That was a lot of information, Detective Fox.

When you discharge from a semiautomatic handgun, does the shell casing get ejected from the gun?

- A. Yes, it does.
- 24 | Q. What about if you're firing a revolver?
 - A. Well, when firing a bullet out of a revolver, the only

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Fox - Direct

thing that leaves the revolver is the actual bullet. To unload or to eject the cartridge casings, you must manually unlock a cylinder from the frame of the revolver and manually take out the cartridge casings from that particular firearm. Q. Does the casing come into contact with anything when it is fired from the firearm? So in a semiautomatic handgun, when the cartridge casing is rested -- or resting in the firearm, and the firearm is ready to be fired, the base of the cartridge casing is resting up against the firearm called the breechface. In the middle of that breechface, there's a hole. We call that hole an aperture. And behind that breechface is a firing pin. when the firing pin goes through that aperture or hole and strikes the back of the cartridge casing, it leaves an indent in the cartridge. So when the firing pin strikes the back of the casing, it leaves an indent in the casing, which leaves marks on the inside of the cartridge. When a firing pin strikes the primer, it causes an explosion, and the -- when it's fired, the base of that cartridge casing will slam up against the firearm. So if

there's any marks on that firearm, they will then be impressed onto the cartridge casing itself after being fired.

- Have you received any special training to perform your duties as a firearms examiner?
- Yes, I have. Α.

Q. What sort of training?

firearm is operable or inoperable.

A. When I was first assigned to the police laboratory, I was trained on how to test firearms and ammunition for operability. Essentially, any firearm or ammunition that comes into the police lab, we must test fire that firearm to see if that

That initial training program lasted six months. I sat with senior members of the firearms analysis section, observed them do their casework.

We took armorist courses. These are courses that are given by gun manufacturers. They teach us how to take apart their firearms, and how to reassemble their firearms, and show us how their particular firearms are manufactured.

I also took written and oral presentations and examinations, and at the end of that six-month training program, upon passing a competency test, I was able to perform firearm examinations.

Upon completing that, I then went into the microscopic training section of the police laboratory. This training program lasted 18 months. And we're trained under AFTE, A-F-T-E. AFTE stands for The Association of Firearm Tool Mark Examiners. They set the standard of toolmark identification within that field. Once again, written, practical, oral examinations and presentations.

The majority of our time, though, the training

Fox - Direct

consisted of looking at ballistic evidence under a microscope, learning how characteristics from a firearm are left on a bullet and cartridge casing when it's fired, identifying sufficient individual characteristics or identifying individual characteristics from a particular firearm, and how it's left on a bullet or cartridge casing.

And at the end of that training program, I was given four competency tests. Two of those competency tests are given outside the New York City Police Department. There's a collaborative testing service. They would send me a microscopic examination. I would complete the examination. I would send my results back to them. They would let me know if I pass or fail.

Every year that I've been trained as a microscopist, I also take a proficiency test.

- Q. What have been the results of those proficiency tests?
- A. I have passed them.
 - Q. Can you describe for the jury what a comparison microscope is?
 - A. A comparison microscope, that's what we use to perform microscopic examinations. It's essentially two microscopes combined through an optical bridge. That optical bridge allows me to look at two different pieces of evidence at the same exact time.

When I'm doing my examination, I'm looking for a

Fox - Direct

sufficient agreement of the individual characteristics that are created during the manufacturing process of the firearm. So when the gun manufacturers use tools to manufacture their weapons, the tool — the marks from the tools are then left inside the firearm. Those toolmarks are characteristics.

They're unique to that particular firearm, like a fingerprint.

When the cartridge casing or bullet is fired out of a firearm, marks from that firearm will then be left on the bullet as it travels through the barrel of the firearm, and the casing, as it hits the breechface and the firing pin, will leave marks on that casing as well. Like I said, those marks are unique to that particular firearm.

My comparison microscope allows me to look at two different pieces of evidence at the same exact time, and I'm trying to match those individual characteristics to determine if I have enough agreement to say that two cartridge casings are fired from the same firearm. I can also use it to say that they are fired from different firearms as well.

- Q. How long have you been doing microscopic comparison analysis?
- 21 | A. Since 2007.
- 22 | Q. Approximately how many comparisons have you done?
- 23 A. Thousands.
- 24 | Q. Have you ever testified before?
 - A. Yes, I have.

Fox - Direct

- 1 | Q. Is that in state court, federal court, or both?
- 2 A. In both.
- 3 | Q. About how many times have you testified before?
- 4 A. I've testified over 350 times.
- 5 | Q. Were you qualified as an expert each time?
- 6 A. Yes, I was.
- 7 MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, the government offers
- 8 Detective Fox as an expert in the field of firearms analysis
- 9 and microscopic comparison.
- 10 | THE COURT: Any objection?
- 11 MR. LIND: No objection.
- 12 | THE COURT: You can inquire on that basis.
- 13 BY MR. FOLLY:
- 14 | Q. Detective Fox, did you examine certain evidence in
- 15 | connection with this case?
- 16 A. Yes, I have.
- 17 | Q. What evidence have you examined?
- 18 A. I examined three cartridge casings -- they were .40 caliber
- 19 | cartridge casings -- and unsuitable deformed pieces of lead,
- 20 | all that we determined to be consistent with buckshot.
- 21 | Q. I'm going to show you first what's in evidence as
- 22 | Government Exhibits 102-A, 102-B, and 102-C. If you could have
- 23 | a look at the items inside of the envelope.
- 24 Have you had a chance to look at those?
- 25 | A. Yes, I have.

Fox - Direct

- 1 Do you recognize them?
- 2 Yes, I do. Α.

I9CKPOL4

- 3 What are they? 0.
- These are three cartridge casings that I performed a 4 Α.
- 5 microscopic comparison on with this particular case.
- 6 recognize each piece of evidence because each casing has my
- 7 initials and the unique lab number associated with that case.
- Q. When you say each casing has your initials, can you 8
- 9 describe for the jury what you mean by that?
- 10 A. My initials and the lab number are etched on to each
- 11 particular cartridge casing.
- 12 MR. FOLLY: Can we publish what's in evidence as
- 13 Government Exhibit 533.
- 14 Do you recognize that photograph? Q.
- Yes, I do. 15 Α.
- 16 How do you recognize it?
- 17 I recognize it -- it's a photo of the three cartridge
- 18 casings that I examined.
- 19 What, if any, analysis did you conduct of these three
- 20 items?
- 21 I conducted a microscopic comparison, trying to determine
- 22 if all three cartridge casings were fired from the same firearm
- 23 or different firearms.
- 24 Q. Can you walk us through the procedure you followed to
- 25 compare each of these items to each other?

A. When I receive these items, I inventory every item that I received. I made sure when I received the items, that they were sealed, and the seals were not broken. I etched each piece of evidence with my initials, the item number, and the unique lab number. I performed cartridge case notes.

Essentially what that is is, it describes what evidence I have, what type of ammunition, who manufactured the type of ammunition, and what kind of characteristics were on that type of evidence when I received it.

After I did that, I performed microscopic comparison, which consisted of me looking at each piece or each cartridge casing against each other using the comparison microscope.

When I'm looking at this piece of evidence or these cartridge casings on a comparison microscope, I'm looking at two at the same time, and I am trying to match up if any -- if there's any individual characteristics left behind from the firearm after its being fired, and then I would complete my examination and come publish my results.

- Q. What were you able to determine, if anything, when comparing these casings to each other?
- A. My microscopic examination concluded that all three cartridge casings were fired from the same firearm based on the sufficient agreement of the individual characteristics of the firing pin and breechface impressions.
- Q. Now I'm going to show you what's in evidence as Government

1 | Exhibit 104.

2

3

4

Do you recognize that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. How do you recognize it?
- A. These are five deformed lead -- unsuitable lead balls that

 we deemed to be consistent with buckshot. I recognize them
- 7 because I performed an examination for this particular case.
- Q. You say they were deemed to be consistent with buckshot.
- 9 Can you describe for the jury what buckshot is?
- 10 A. Buckshot is common projectiles that go inside a shot shell.
- I described earlier what a live cartridge was, how the bullet sticks out of the top of the cartridge. The way buckshot works is that with a shot shell, you don't see the
- 14 projectiles. The projectiles are actually in the shot shell,
- and they're typically little, round lead balls.
- Once you fire the buckshot, the round balls are pushed

 out of the shot shells and out of the front of the -- whatever

 is firing it, and they tend to disburse at a wider pattern than
- 19 | that of a regular bullet.
- When I examined these shot shells, I weighed and
 measured them, and it became -- I determined them to be
 consistent with buckshot, which is used to be fired out of a
- 23 | shot shell.
- 24 | Q. What type of firearms are used to fire buckshot?
- 25 A. Buckshot can be fired out of a shotgun. It can also be

Fox - Direct

fired out of certain types of revolvers. 1

I9CKPOL4

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- What happens when buckshot is fired? Starting first what 0. happens when buckshot is fired out of a shotgun?
- Like I said, generally the reason why buckshot is manufactured is it's to hit an object that's closer to you. has a better chance of hitting it. Some shot shells could hold 12 buckshot, some could hold, depending on the size, a lot more buckshot, but the whole purpose of the reason for having buckshot is when it's fired out of a shotgun or the revolver, it creates a wider pattern, so it's easier to hit something

It's essentially, in this particular case, five bullets fired out of one shot shell or out of one casing, so to So the general purpose of a shotgun is to have a better speak. chance of hitting your target with different projectiles.

Q. You also mentioned that you found this buckshot was unsuitable. What does that mean?

closer to you as opposed to firing one bullet.

A. Unsuitable means that there was no individual characteristics left behind from the firearm. We use -- the way we identify two pieces of evidence being fired from the same firearm, we base it on individual characteristics, meaning characteristics from the firearm left on a projectile as it leaves the firearm.

In this particular case, these lead balls did not have any individual characteristics left on it when being fired,

- I9CKPOL4 Fox - Cross which is consistent with buckshot. 1 2 MR. FOLLY: No further questions, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Cross-examination, Mr. Lind? 4 MR. LIND: Yes. 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. LIND: 6 7 Q. Good afternoon. I have some questions about -- you do a microscopy worksheet, correct, in connection with your duties? 8 9 A. Excuse me? 10 You do a microscopy worksheet? 11 Α. I do, yes. 12 And you did that in this case, correct? 13 Α. I did, yes. 14 And you did that with respect to both the buckshot and the 15 cartridge casing, correct? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Now, the -- for the three cartridge casings, there's a 18 title of identifying marks against the firing pin. You see that? 19 20 A. I don't have that in front of me. MR. LIND: Could someone place his 3500 in front --
- 21
- 22 should I go up? I'll approach him.
- 23 MR. FOLLY: Sure.
- 24 MR. LIND: May I approach, Judge?
- 25 THE COURT: Yes.

I9CKPOL4 Fox - Cross

- 1 BY MR. LIND:
- 2 | Q. Do you see that that's the firing pin?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. What does that mean, the firing pin?
- 5 A. It's the shape of the firing pin impression that's left.
- 6 So in this particular case, that's hemispherical, which means
- 7 | it's a round shape. Some firing pins are elliptical or
- 8 | rectangular, others are circular, and others could be --
- 9 depending on what type of firearm, could be a square, circle,
- 10 | hemispherical, elliptical.
- 11 | Q. So you determined that this was shot out of a weapon with a
- 12 | hemispherical firing pin; is that correct?
- 13 A. That's correct.
- 14 Q. A Glock does not have a hemispherical firing pin, does it?
- 15 A. They have elliptical firing pins.
- 16 Q. So that's a different type?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. So in your analysis, you were using the wrong firing pin,
- 19 | correct?
- 20 A. Excuse me?
- 21 | Q. Well, your analysis says that this came out of a
- 22 | hemispherical firing pin, correct?
- 23 A. Well, we don't have the firearm recovered in this
- 24 particular case.
- 25 | Q. Well, then why did you put down hemispherical? Because of

Fox - Cross

- 1 | the impression on the back?
- 2 A. Well, Glock firearms typically have elliptical firing pins,
- 3 but no Glock firearm was recovered in this case. These
- 4 particular cartridge casings were fired out of a firearm that
- 5 had a hemispherical firing pin impression.
- 6 Q. And a Glock has an elliptical firing pin, correct?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. So the weapon that they were all fired out of was not a
- 9 | Glock, correct?
- 10 A. I didn't compare it to any weapon.
- 11 | Q. But you determined that the gun that this was fired -- the
- 12 | weapon that this was fired out of was a weapon with a
- 13 hemispherical firing pin, correct?
- 14 A. Correct.
- 15 | Q. And a Glock does not have a hemispherical firing pin,
- 16 correct?
- 17 A. Glock makes their guns --
- 18 Q. No, my question is very simple. Glock does not have a
- 19 hemispherical firing pin, yes or no?
- 20 | A. I don't know. I didn't compare it to a Glock.
- 21 | Q. Well, do you remember testifying in other cases regarding
- 22 | types of firing pins? Do you remember testifying --
- 23 | A. I do. And Glock also makes hemispherical firing pin
- 24 | impressions now, and they also make elliptical firing pins.
- 25 I'm not saying it wasn't fired from a gun, but I didn't compare

I9CKPOL4 Fox - Cross

- 1 | it to a particular firearm.
- 2 Q. Well, do you remember testifying in front of a federal
- 3 court in August of 2015, in front of Judge Koeltl?
- 4 A. Maybe.
- 5 Q. And do you remember being asked this question and giving
- 6 these answers:
- 7 | "Q. So a computer can't make a cartridge casing match?
- 8 "A. It cannot, no.
- 9 "Q. Only a human being can make a cartridge casing match?
- 10 | "A. Correct."
- 11 MR. LIND: One moment, Judge. I have a --
- 12 | "Q. Now, going back to the firing pin, Taurus uses a circular
- 13 | firing pin, correct?
- 14 "A. Yes, they do.
- 15 | "Q. Glock uses an elliptical or oval firing pin?
- 16 "A. Glock uses an elliptical. I believe to describe Taurus's
- 17 || firing pin as a hemispherical type firing pin."
- Do you remember being asked those questions and giving
- 19 | that testimony?
- 20 | A. I don't.
- 21 MR. LIND: May I approach, Judge?
- 22 THE COURT: Yes.
- 23 | Q. I show you --
- 24 A. No, I believe that I gave the testimony. I just don't
- 25 remember the testimony.

Fox - Cross

- Q. Okay. But you testified that Glock has an elliptical, not a hemispherical firing pin, correct?
- 3 A. What I'm telling you is that Glock typically has elliptical
- 4 | firing pins. They also make firearms now that don't have
- 5 | elliptical firing pins. I'm not saying that three cartridge
- 6 casings that I examined in this case aren't fired from a
- 7 | firearm that I never compared it to.
- 8 Q. Now, when you say they now have hemispherical firing pins,
- 9 as of when?
- 10 A. I don't know as of the date they're manufactured.
- 11 Q. You gave this testimony on August 4, 2015. On August 4,
- 12 | 2015, you stated that Glock had an elliptical firing pin.
- 13 And that was true as of August 4, 2015, correct?
- 14 A. Correct.
- 15 | Q. Now, you talked about characteristics, correct?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. There are two different types of characteristics in doing
- 18 | firearm analysis, correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 Q. There's class characteristics, right?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. And individual characteristics of the particular casing or
- 23 | bullet, right?
- 24 A. Correct.
- 25 | Q. The more difficult analysis is the individual

Fox - Cross

- 1 | characteristics analysis, correct?
- A. Well, that's what we use to identify if it's been fired from the same particular firearm.
- 4 Q. So a computer cannot make a cartridge casing match, right?
- 5 A. What we're saying is we use the computer to see if there's
- a potential match. We'll never say that two cartridge casings
- 7 match each other just based on it being a match on a computer.
- 8 We physically pull the evidence, and look at the evidence under
- 9 a microscope, and confirm if it's a match or not.
- 10 | Q. So it's fair to say only a human being can make a cartridge
- 11 casing match, correct?
- 12 A. As far as the procedure of New York City Police Department,
- 13 | only a microscopist can say that two cartridge casings are a
- 14 match.
- 15 | Q. And that is a human being, a microscopist?
- 16 | A. Yes, it is.
- 17 | Q. That's because, essentially, it's a subjective test in
- 18 deciding about individual characteristics? Yes or no?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. Now, you're familiar with a study by the National Academy
- 21 of Forensic Science in the United States, are you not?
- 22 | A. I am, yes.
- 23 | Q. There was a 2009 article. Do you remember that?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Or book. It was actually a book, right?

Fox - Cross

- A. I read -- I didn't read the whole book, I just read the article.
- Q. And part of it was talking about toolmark and firearms analysis. Do you recall that?
 - A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

- Q. You've given your opinion on that analysis, correct? Do you recall testifying about that?
 - A. I believe so.
 - MR. LIND: Now, may I read this portion, Judge, and see what the witness' analysis is, or may I ask him to read it?

 THE COURT: Well, why don't you pose it in the form of a question and see --
- MR. LIND: Okay.
- 14 BY MR. LIND:
- Q. Do you remember part of the portion regarding toolmark
 analysis said that, although some studies have been performed
 under degree of similarity that can be found between marks made
 by different tools and the variability in marks made by an
 individual tool, the scientific knowledge base for toolmark and
 firearms analysis is fairly limited? Do you recall reading
 that?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Now, is that the fact or not?
- A. No. That's what they investigated, but they also didn't finish investigating. They said more research needs to be

Fox - Cross

- done. A lot of that had to do with ballistic imaging and making matches based on computer images, and a lot of that didn't take into account all the validation studies that we use in determining if two things are fired from the same firearm.

 Q. Well, do you recall, also, that the article or publication said, but the capsule summary suggests a heavy reliance on subjective findings? Do you remember that's what you just
- said. To make the individual characteristics analysis, you are relying on your own subjective analysis, correct?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 | Q. And that's a limitation in toolmark analysis, correct?
- A. I don't know if it's a limitation. It's just based -- it's

 a subjective -- we make our opinions -- or we make our

 examinations and our conclusions based on what we see under a
- 15 microscope and what we concluded.
- Q. But the conclusion is based on your own subjective analysis, right?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- Q. Not based on a microscope, not based on a machine that can make a more objective analysis, right?
- 21 | A. Correct.

25

- Q. One other sentence: "Overall, the process for toolmark and firearms comparisons lacks the specificity of the protocols set for, say, 13 STR DNA analysis."
 - Is that right?

1	A. I believe so. That being said, analyzing DNA is far
2	different than analyzing two projectiles fired from a firearm.
3	MR. LIND: I have nothing further.
4	THE COURT: Any further questions, Mr. Folly?
5	MR. FOLLY: No further questions, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
7	You can step down.
8	THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.
9	(Witness excused)
10	THE COURT: Would you call the government's next
11	witness.
12	MR. KROUSE: Yes, your Honor.
13	The government calls Criminalist Heather Nelson.
14	HEATHER NELSON,
15	called as a witness by the Government,
16	having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
17	THE LAW CLERK: Please state and spell your name for
18	the record.
19	THE WITNESS: Heather Nelson, N-e-l-s-o-n.
20	THE COURT: You can inquire, Mr. Krouse.
21	MR. KROUSE: Thank you, your Honor.
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. KROUSE:
24	Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Nelson.
25	A. Good afternoon.

- 1 | Q. Where do you currently work?
- 2 | A. I'm currently employed at the Office of the Chief Medical
- 3 Examiner in the Department of Forensic Biology.
- 4 | Q. Is there a shorthand way to refer to the Office of the
- 5 Chief Medical Examiner?
- 6 A. The OCME.
- 7 | Q. And is OCME a private or public organization?
- 8 A. We're a public organization.
- 9 Q. Is OCME part of the NYPD?
- 10 A. No, we are not. We are under the Department of Health.
- 11 | Q. How long have you worked for OCME?
- 12 A. It will be 12 years in November.
- 13 | Q. I think you mentioned this, but do you work within a
- 14 particular unit of OCME?
- 15 A. Yes. In the Department of Forensic Biology.
- 16 | Q. What, generally, does OCME's Department of Forensic Biology
- 17 do?
- 18 A. We perform DNA testing on crime scene evidence.
- 19 | Q. Who submits most of the evidence that you perform analysis
- 20 on?
- 21 | A. The NYPD.
- 22 | Q. Ms. Nelson, what is your title with the OCME?
- 23 | A. I am a criminalist, level IV.
- 24 | Q. About how long have you had that title?
- 25 A. Just over four years.

- Q. What duties and responsibilities do you have as a criminalist, level IV?
- A. As a criminalist, level IV, I will examine evidence for biological material, such as blood, semen, saliva, or skin
- 5 cells. I will then send that on for DNA testing. I will
- perform the steps of the DNA process. I will then interpret
 the results from the DNA testing and write reports.
- I also do technical review of other analyst's reports.
- 9 I testify in court as needed. And I also supervise other 10 criminalists in the laboratory.
- Q. Before you became a criminalist, level IV, what other titles did you hold within OCME?
- 13 A. I was a criminalist, level I, II, and III.
- 14 Q. What's the highest level of criminalist at OCME?
- 15 | A. IV.
- Q. How do you advance from one level to the next, all the way up to IV?
- A. It's a promotional process, as well as educational requirements at certain levels.
- 20 | Q. You said you have been at OCME about 12 years, correct?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. Before that, where did you work?
- 23 A. I was at the Connecticut state forensics lab for a year.
- 24 | O. Before that?
- 25 A. The university of Connecticut.

- 1 | Q. And then were you in school before that?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 | Q. Could you please describe your educational background?
- 4 A. I have a Bachelor's of Science in molecular and cell
- 5 | biology from the University of Connecticut, as well as a
- 6 Master's of Science in applied genetics, also from the
- 7 University of Connecticut.
- 8 | Q. Is OCME's forensic biology lab accredited to conduct
- 9 forensic DNA analysis?
- 10 \parallel A. Yes, we are.
- 11 | Q. And whom is the lab accredited by?
- 12 | A. We are accredited by the American Quality Standards
- 13 | Institute, National Accreditation Board, as well as the New
- 14 York State Commission on Forensic Science.
- 15 \parallel Q. What does it mean to be accredited as a forensic biology
- 16 | lab?
- 17 | A. It means that we meet or exceed certain standards that are
- 18 set forth by these agencies.
- 19 | Q. Approximately how many DNA cases would you estimate OCME's
- 20 | lab handles each year?
- 21 A. Tens of thousands.
- 22 | Q. What, if any, training have you personally received that's
- 23 | specific to DNA testing?
- 24 | A. So for each technique that we perform in the laboratory, we
- 25 | first watch an experienced analyst perform that technique. We

6

7

8

9

10

- then will perform that technique while an experienced analyst
 watches us. We will then perform the technique independently.

 And then we perform a competency test for every technique we do
 in the laboratory.
 - What a competency test is, is where the results are known to our supervisor, but they're unknown to ourself. We perform the technique, and our supervisor will tell us whether we pass or fail.
 - Q. If you pass these competency tests, are you then able to perform the tests on your own?
- 11 \square A. Yes, we are.
- Q. How many DNA tests would you estimate that you personally performed during your career?
- 14 A. Thousands.
- 15 | Q. You said you're also a supervisor in the lab, correct?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- Q. How many DNA tests that were performed by others would you say that you have reviewed while you've been at OCME?
- 19 A. Hundreds.
- Q. Could you please describe some of the cases you've worked
- 21 on, just generally speaking?
- 22 | A. I've worked on all sorts of crime types, including
- 23 | homicides, sexual assaults, assaults, burglaries, and
- 24 robberies, and criminal possession of a weapon.
- 25 | Q. Now, when you're analyzing an object to see whether that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

21

22

25

- object has DNA on it, how do you go about doing that? How do you get the objects sampled to test in the first place? A. We will first receive the evidence from our evidence unit. Our evidence unit will take the evidence from NYPD and keep it in a secure locked facility until an analyst will go and retrieve the evidence to examine it. We will then mark the markings of the packaging and make sure it has been properly sealed before we open it.
 - We will then open the item and examine it for biological materials, whether we're looking for blood, semen, saliva, or skin cells. We will then take any stainings that we see, or in the matter of skin cells where we can't see the skin cells from the naked eye, we will cut usually a swab that's taken from an item or swab that item ourselves and send that on for DNA testing.
 - You mentioned swabs. What are swabs?
- So swabs are kind of like a Q-tip where it's a wooden stick 17 with cotton on the end. 18
- 19 What's the significance of the swab in your practice of 20 analyzing DNA evidence?
 - A. So swabs are routinely used to pick up skin cells from an item.
- 23 Q. What role, if any, does OCME play in preparing the swabs of 24 any item, like firearms or any other item that you're analyzing?

7

8

9

21

22

Nelson - Direct

- A. So for firearms, we do not -- it's our procedure not to

 accept any firearms to our laboratory. So the NYPD lab will

 actually swab the areas of the gun for us and submit the swabs

 for us to test. For certain other items, such as bottles or

 knives, we will actually receive some of those items and
 - Q. What if the item is something really large, like a vehicle, would you swab the item yourself, or would the NYPD do that?
 - A. The NYPD would do that as well.

actually swab them ourselves.

- Q. Does OCME provide any training to the NYPD on how to properly swab items to recover DNA?
- 12 A. Yes, we have.
- Q. Ms. Nelson, have you previously testified in court cases about DNA analysis performed on physical evidence?
- 15 A. Yes, I have.
- 16 | Q. Approximately how many times have you testified?
- 17 | A. Fifty.
- Q. In how many of those instances were you testifying as an expert in the field of DNA analysis?
- 20 A. All of them.
 - MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, we ask that Ms. Nelson be qualified as an expert in DNA analysis.
- 23 MR. LIND: No objection.
- 24 THE COURT: You can inquire on that basis.
- MR. KROUSE: Thank you, your Honor.

1 BY MR. KROUSE:

4

5

- Q. Now, let's discuss how the laboratory goes about testing DNA.
 - First, can you explain to the jury what exactly DNA is?
- 6 A. So DNA is the genetic material that makes us who we are.
- 7 We get half of our DNA from our mom and half of our DNA from
- 8 our dad. 99 percent of our DNA is the same amongst all of us.
- 9 We have two eyes, two ears, a nose, a mouth. There is
- 10 | approximately 1 percent of our DNA that's unique, and it's
- 11 | within that 1 percent that we look at.
- 12 | Q. You mentioned this, but does the lab test, in certain
- 13 | instances, DNA that's left behind on objects?
- 14 | A. Yes, we do.
- 15 | Q. What kind of objects, generally?
- 16 A. It's a whole variety of objects, but it includes bottles,
- 17 | knives, weapons, guns.
- 18 | Q. In this case, what two items did you analyze?
- 19 A. We received swabs from a vehicle, including the steering
- 20 wheel and the gearshift, as well as swabs from a gun that was
- 21 | recovered.
- 22 | Q. You said a swab is like a Q-tip with, like, a wooden
- 23 | handle. What would have provided the DNA on that object that
- 24 was then swabbed off of it with that Q-tip?
- 25 A. For the swaps from the gun, as well as the swabs from the

- 1 | vehicle, we were looking for skin cells.
- 2 Q. When the NYPD submits swabs of touched objects, like guns
- 3 or cars, is there always enough DNA on those swabs to be tested
- 4 | by your lab?
- 5 A. No.
- 6 Q. Can you explain that?
- 7 A. Because we're dealing with skin cells, it depends on a lot
- 8 | of variables, but, ultimately, we're looking for who touched
- 9 | that object. So because of that, depending on how long someone
- 10 may have touched that item or if they shed any of their skin
- 11 cells onto that item when they touched it will depend if we
- 12 retrieve any DNA from that swab.
- 13 | Q. Are there other factors that might explain whether or not
- 14 | there would be sufficient DNA left behind on an object?
- 15 | A. Yes. Depending on how long someone may have touched
- 16 something, as well as if they had just washed their hands
- 17 | previously, they may not leave any DNA or much DNA on the
- 18 object once they touch it after their wash their hands.
- 19 | Q. I guess how long ago they touched it, would that also
- 20 | affect whether or not there were skin cells left behind?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. When there is enough DNA on a swab, what steps does OCME
- 23 | follow to determine whether there is DNA on that swab?
- 24 A. So in the DNA process, we first will examine the evidence.
- 25 When we submit it for the DNA testing, the first part of DNA

Nelson - Direct

testing is called extraction, and this is where we are going to break open the cells, whether it's the skin cells, or the blood cells, or the sperm cells, to release the DNA from that sample.

We then perform a technique called quantitation, and this is where we see how much DNA we have in that sample. If we have enough to go on for the rest of the process, it will then get moved on to the next step, which is called PCR amplification, and this where we're making millions and millions of copies of certain locations on the DNA that we're looking at, and this is because we need to be able to visualize the DNA.

That then gets put onto a machine where it generates the data for us, so then we can interpret the data and generate the DNA profile.

- Q. You mentioned the end state of that series of steps is that you develop a DNA profile. Can you explain what a DNA profile is?
- A. So we look at 15 different locations on the DNA, including a sex determining region, so we'll know whether it's a male or a female. Those 15 locations are visualized from that machine, and in those 15 locations, we see the form of numbers. So I wouldn't be able to tell you hair color, eye color, or anything. What we see is in the form of numbers.

If we string those numbers up through all 15 of those locations, that's what we call a DNA profile. It's kind of

- 1 | like a genetic barcode.
- 2 Q. In situations where you are able to develop a DNA profile
- 3 | from a swab coming from a touched object, does that profile
- 4 always correlate to one person, or can it correlate to multiple
- 5 people?
- 6 A. It could be either from one individual or from multiple
- 7 | individuals. So because we get DNA -- half of our DNA from our
- 8 mom and half from our dad, at each of those locations, we're
- 9 going to see for one individual, at most, two numbers, meaning
- 10 | they got one number from their mom and one from their dad.
- If we see multiple locations with more than two
- 12 | numbers, that's indicative of a mixture, meaning we have more
- 13 | than one person's DNA from that sample.
- 14 | Q. Now, Ms. Nelson, for this case, did you use a particular
- 15 program to analyze a mixture of DNA?
- 16 A. Yes, I did.
- 17 | Q. Can you explain what program that is?
- 18 A. The computer program is called the Forensic Statistical
- 19 | Tool. So for mixtures -- there's certain types of mixtures
- 20 that we can see. The first type of mixture is where we can see
- 21 | that one person left more of their DNA than the other, and in
- 22 | that case, we would have a major contributor and possibly a
- 23 minor contributor to the mixture.
- In other mixtures, if individuals contribute about the
- 25 same amount of DNA, and we're unable to tell the individual

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

22

24

25

- contributors, those are just suitable for comparison, meaning we'll take a known sample from a known individual and compare their numbers from their DNA profile to the numbers that we see in the mixture of DNA in the sample to see if they're possibly included as a possible contributor. If they are, then we will perform a statistic on that using this computer program called the Forensic Statistical Tool. What this does is it's performing a likelihood ratio. What a likelihood ratio is it's looking at two different scenarios and coming up with what's the more probable scenario.
- Q. Now, you mentioned that in this case, you analyzed swabs from both a gun and also from the vehicle, correct?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 Did you compare those swabs to known DNA samples from 15 particular individuals?
- 16 Yes, I did. Α.
- 17 There were three DNA samples obtained from individuals 18 through a bottle that they used, correct?
- That is correct. 19 Α.
- 20 Can you explain how OCME obtains a DNA sample, a known DNA 21 sample from an abandoned bottle?
- So the bottle is sent to our laboratory where we will 23 examine it. So what we do is we take one of those cotton swabs with a wooden stick, and we'll swab the mouth area of the bottle, so the outer part of the mouth, as well as the inner

- 1 part of the mouth, and if it came received with a cap on the
- 2 bottle, we'll also swab the interior part of the cap as well.
- 3 That swab is then sent on for the DNA process, so we can
- 4 generate a DNA profile from it.
- Q. And you can generate a DNA profile based on whoever used
- 6 | that bottle?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Was there also a DNA sample for a known individual obtained
- 9 | through a buccal swab?
- 10 A. Yes, there was.
- 11 | Q. Can you explain to the jury what a buccal swab is?
- 12 A. So a buccal swab is that same type of cotton swab that is
- 13 applied, put into someone's mouth, and the inside of the cheek
- 14 | is rubbed to obtain some skin cells onto that swab. That swab
- 15 | is then cut and sent on for the DNA process where we obtain a
- 16 | DNA profile.
- 17 | Q. After obtaining a DNA sample from a known individual, how
- 18 can you compare that sample to the DNA that was found on an
- 19 | object?
- 20 A. So, again, we have the numbers at the different locations
- 21 | for the known individual. We'll then look at those numbers
- 22 | that we have from the mixture and see if we see the numbers
- 23 | from that individual at those locations in the mixture as well.
- 24 | If we do, then we will perform the statistical calculation as
- 25 | well.

release of the pistol.

Nelson - Direct

1 So you're looking to see the extent to which the barcodes match? 2 3 A. Yes. 4 MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, at this time, the government 5 would like to read a stipulation, Government Exhibit 1004. 6 THE COURT: Yes. 7 MR. KROUSE: The parties have stipulated that: "The DNA swabs received by the New York City Office of the Chief 8 9 Medical Examiner and associated with voucher number 2000455460 10 were taken on August 7, 2015, from a 2015 Toyota Camry with 11 Florida license plate number 122PRA. 12 "Item 1 is a swab of the steering wheel. 13 "Item 2 is a swab of the gearshift. 14 "Item 3 is a swab of the interior door. 15 "The DNA swabs received by the New York City Office of the Chief Medical Examiner and associated with voucher number 16 17 2000461970 were taken on August 27, 2015, from a Kel-Tec .9 18 millimeter semiautomatic pistol (the pistol) that has been marked as Government Exhibit 101. 19 20 "Item 1 is a swab of the trigger/trigger quard of the 21 pistol. 22 "Item 2 is a swab of the front/back strap/grips of the 23 pistol. 24 "Item 3 is a swab of the slide grip groove/magazine

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Nelson - Direct

"The DNA sample received by the New York City Office of the Chief Medical Examiner and associated with voucher number 2000462034 was taken from a bottle used by Terrell Polk. "The DNA sample received by the New York City Office of the Chief Medical Examiner and associated with voucher number 2000462052 was taken from a bottle used by Kevin Corbett. "The DNA sample received by the New York City Office of the Chief Medical Examiner and associated with voucher number 2000462048 was taken from a bottle used by Timothy Smith. "The DNA sample received by the New York City Office of the Chief Medical Examiner and associated with voucher number 6000011470 was taken from Terrell Polk." The government offers Government Exhibit 1004. I have no objection. MR. LIND: THE COURT: It will be admitted into evidence. (Government's Exhibit 1004 received in evidence) BY MR. KROUSE: Q. Ms. Nelson, the stipulation that was just read mentioned voucher number 6000011470 was a sample taken from Terrell Polk, correct? 23 Α. Yes. Was that a buccal swab taken from Terrell Polk? Ο. Yes, it was. Α.

- Q. Ms. Nelson, did you generate reports as part of your responsibility for testing the DNA in this case?
 - A. Yes, I did.

3

4

5

6

7

8

- MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, if you can put on the screen Government Exhibit 401, the first page, for Ms. Nelson, and then 402, 403, 404, 405.
- Q. Are these all reports that you generated in the course of your analysis of the DNA in this case?
- 9 A. Yes, it is.
- 10 Q. Do you know who any of the individuals identified in this 11 report are in real life?
- 12 A. No, I do not.
- Q. Would you recognize any of them in this courtroom today if they were present?
- 15 A. No, I cannot.
- Q. And who prepared all of these reports that are marked as Government Exhibits 401 through 405?
- 18 | A. I did.

23

- Q. Were these reports prepared and maintained in the regular course of business at OMCE?
- 21 A. Yes, they were.
- Q. Were they prepared close in time to the time when the
- 24 A. Yes, they were.

underlying testing was done?

MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, the government offers

```
I9CAAPOL5
                                 Nelson - Direct
                MR. LIND: May I be heard at the side bar?
 1
 2
                THE COURT: Yes.
 3
                (Continued on next page)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	(side bar)
2	MR. LIND: Judge, I am missing one for Terrell Polk
3	and the swab of his mouth for the weapon in the car.
4	MR. KROUSE: So that's in 404. All the Terrell Polk
5	sufficient is 404.
6	MR. LIND: I am talking about the gun. I am sorry,
7	judge.
8	MR. KROUSE: So it says there's DNA profile.
9	MR. LIND: OK. Just say it's on the flip side.
10	MR. KROUSE: I am going to do it on the screen so
11	it'll come in.
12	THE COURT: OK.
13	MR. LIND: I just was raising that I didn't see that.
14	(Continued on next page)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Α.

Yes, it is.

1 (In open court) MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, the government offers 2 3 Government Exhibits 401 through 405. 4 MR. LIND: No objection. 5 THE COURT: It'll be admitted into evidence. 6 (Government's Exhibits 401 - 405 received in evidence) 7 BY MR. KROUSE: Q. Ms. Nelson, one item analyzed in this case was a gun, 8 9 correct? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. What items did your lab receive in order to test whether 12 the gun had DNA on it? 13 A. We received three swabs from the gun. The swab from the 14 trigger/trigger guards, swabs from the front and back strap and 15 swabs from the slide. Are those three different areas on a gun? 16 17 Yes, they were. Α. 18 Q. And are those three areas likely to be touched by a person? 19 A. Yes. 20 MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you put Government 21 Exhibit 401 on the screen for everyone and please go to page 22 six. 23 (Pause) 24 Ms. Nelson, is the voucher for the gun swabs?

- Q. And it shows three different locations. And are those the three different locations you just testified about?
- 3 | A. Yes.

9

10

- 4 | Q. What is the invoice number at the top for the voucher?
- 5 A. It is 2000461970.
- Q. Did you record the voucher number from the swabs of the gun anywhere in your report?
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you bring up page two of the report.
- 11 (Pause)
- Q. Do you see the voucher number associated with the three gun swabs on this page of your report?
- 14 A. Yes, I do.
- 15 \parallel Q. What is it?
- 16 A. 2000461970.
- Q. What did you do with the swabs of the gun that you received from the NYPD?
- 19 A. So they were first examined. Meaning, they were taken out
- 20 from the evidence unit, the documentation of the packaging was
- 21 documented. It was then opened and the swab was then, the
- 22 cotton portion was cut and sent on for DNA testing.
- Q. Was each swab tested together or were they each tested
- 24 separately?
- 25 A. Separately.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you bring up page one of Government Exhibit 401.

(Pause)

- Q. Ms. Nelson, I am directing your attention to the results and conclusions that you drew from your analysis of the DNA swabs from the gun. Could you read your results and conclusions?
- A. Human DNA sufficient for STR DNA typing was detected on the swab from the trigger/trigger guard and from the swab of the front back strap and grips.
- Q. What does that mean in plain terms?
- A. That means that at that quantitation stage where we see how much DNA that we have in a sample, each of those samples from those swabs had enough to go on for SDR DNA testing.
 - Q. As to the trigger/trigger guard, what was the determination of what type of DNA was on that swab?
- 17 So for the trigger/trigger quard, that was a mixture of DNA 18 from at least two people that was detected from that sample. This was a mixture of DNA where we were able to determine that 19 20 one person contributed more of their DNA than the other. 21 person that contributed more of their DNA was deemed a major 22 contributor to this sample and was given the designation of 23 "Male Donor A". This just means that we have an unknown 24 profile and we just use the letters of the alphabet to 25 distinguish the different DNA profile.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

22

23

Nelson - Direct

The DNA profile of the minor contributor to this mixture could not be determined and the results for the minor contributor are not suitable for a comparison. This means that there was not enough information in the mixture to say anything about a minor contributor.

- MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, could you zoom-out of that and then zoom-in to the second paragraph on the report.
- Q. Ms. Nelson, is that where you concluded that there was one major male contributor, Male Donor A?
- Wa. Yes.
- Q. Was that the swab of the trigger/trigger guard, correct?
- 12 A. Correct.
- Q. Now as to the analysis of the swab for the front/back strap/grips of the gun, what was your result?
- MR. KROUSE: And if Mr. Concepcion, if you could zoom-in on the last two paragraphs.
- A. So for the swab from the front/back strap and grip, there
 was a mixture of DNA found in the sample as well. However, for
 this sample we were not able to determine that one person
 contributed more of their DNA to the other. So this mixture is
 just suitable for comparison.
 - Q. So there is no major donor "A" or minor donor that was detected on this part of the qun?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- MR. KROUSE: Now, Mr. Concepcion, could you

532

I9CAAPOL5

actually --

1

7

- Actually, Ms. Nelson, you said there were three different 2
- 3 locations of the gun that were swabbed. Just for a sake of
- 4 completeness, did you also look at the slide, grip,
- 5 groove/magazine release of the gun?
- 6 Α. Yes.
 - Was there enough DNA to analyze for that swab?
- So there was an insufficient amount of DNA detected in 8
- 9 that sample. So that didn't go on for further DNA testing.
- 10 Q. Did there come a time when you compared the DNA found on
- 11 these two locations, the trigger/trigger guard and the
- 12 front/back trap and grip to known DNA samples of individuals?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Did you compare the DNA on the gun to three different
- 15 individuals?
- 16 Yes, I did. Α.
- 17 You said that but how did you initially obtain DNA samples
- from those three individuals? 18
- A. They were from bottles that were submitted that were used 19
- 20 by each of the three individuals. Those bottles were then
- 21 swabbed at our laboratory and sent on for DNA testing where we
- 22 obtained a DNA profile. And that DNA profile for each of those
- 23 individuals was compared to the samples.
- 24 MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, could we start with
- 25 Government Exhibit 404.

- Q. Ms. Nelson, could you read at the top whose DNA was being analyzed for this report?
 - A. Terrell Polk.

- 4 | Q. And was the voucher number for the bottle submitted for
- 5 Mr. Polk recorded in your report?
- 6 A. Yes, it was.
- 7 MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, could you go to page two 8 of this report.
- 9 Q. Do you see the voucher number on this document?
- 10 | A. Yes, I do.
- 11 \square Q. What is it?
- 12 A. 2000462034.
- MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you bring on the screen Government Exhibit 403 and go to page two.
- 15 (Pause)
- Q. And is the voucher number for the bottle for Timothy Smith also recorded here?
- 18 | A. Yes, it is.
- 19 | Q. And it says there are bottles submitted for Timothy Smith?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. Can you read that voucher number?
- 22 A. It is 2000462048.
- MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you bring on the screen Government Exhibit 402 and also go to page two.
- 25 | Q. Do you see the voucher number for the bottle submitted for

- 1 | Kevin Corbett?
- 2 | A. Yes, I do.
- 3 Q. And it's misspelled. I guess it says "Crobett". What's
- 4 | the voucher number there?
- 5 A. 2000462052.
- 6 Q. And you testified that you created DNA profiles based on
- 7 | the bottles that each of these men used, correct?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And what did you do with each of those DNA profiles?
- 10 A. They were then compared to the results of the swabs from
- 11 | the qun. So the DNA profile from the Male Donor A was compared
- 12 | to each of these three individuals to see if any of them
- 13 | matched that Male Donor A profile. Then for the other swab
- 14 | from the front and back strap, that was just a mixture for
- 15 comparison those individual DNA profiles, so for each of their
- 16 DNA profiles, the numbers at each of the locations was looked
- 17 | to see if they were in the mixture at those locations. If most
- 18 or all of their numbers were seen in that mixture, they were
- 19 considered possible a contributor to that mixture and then we
- 20 performed a likely ratio statistic.
- 21 Q. So if they were deemed a possible contributor to the
- 22 | mixture, then you calculated some sort of probability that they
- 23 | would have been the person who touched that gun, correct?
- 24 A. Correct.
- 25 MR. KROUSE: Let's take each individual one at a time

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

23

24

25

Nelson - Direct

1 and start with Mr. Polk.

Mr. Concepcion, can you bring on the screen Government Exhibit 404 and could you go to page six.

(Pause)

MR. KROUSE: Could you zoom-in on the results and conclusions to the bottom?

(Pause)

- Q. Ms. Nelson, what was the result of the comparison between the DNA on the gun and Mr. Polk's DNA sample from the abandoned bottle?
- 11 A. The donor to the bottle submitted for Terrell Polk is
 12 excluded when compared to other samples where comparisons could
 13 be made.
 - Q. That's for the gun, correct?
- 15 A. That's correct.
- 16 | Q. What does it mean to be excluded as a contributor?
- A. That means that he was not the Male Donor A profile that we determined from the trigger/trigger guard swab. And when comparing his numbers to the numbers in the mixture for the front and back straps, either there weren't very many or none at all of his numbers seen in that mixture. Therefore, he was
- 22 excluded as a possible contributor.
 - Q. Based on the DNA test performed on the gun, do you have an opinion about whether the DNA of Terrell Polk was on the gun that was swabbed for DNA?

- 1 A. We did not detect his DNA, no.
- 2 \parallel Q. What is your opinion?
- 3 A. He is not on the gun.
- 4 | Q. Just to review what, are some of the sources of DNA on the
- 5 | human body that might have been left behind on a gun?
- 6 A. Most likely skin cells from someone that would have touched
- 7 | the gun. Also, if someone is in close proximity and may have
- 8 been talking over the gun, they may have spit and left some of
- 9 | their DNA on the gun as well.
- 10 | Q. Are some individuals less likely and more likely to leave
- 11 DNA behind on objects that they touched?
- 12 A. Yes, they are.
- 13 | O. Are there reasons for that?
- 14 A. Yes. Again, if someone just what washed their hands prior
- 15 | to touching an object, they may not leave any skin cells behind
- 16 because in washing their hands they would have shed off any
- 17 | skin cells available on their hands. If someone was sweating
- 18 | they may leave more skin cells behind than others.
- 19 | Environmental factors can come into play. If someone touches
- 20 on item but then it's, water comes in contact with that item,
- 21 | it may away any skin cells that may have been left behind.
- 22 | Q. Can the type of object make any difference as to whether
- 23 | DNA is left behind or not?
- 24 A. Yes. Certain surfaces, smoother surfaces may not detect as
- 25 | much DNA and a person may not leave as much DNA behind as

- opposed to some type of object that has crevices or some type of place where the skin cells can kind of collect.
 - Q. Based on the facts that you've testified to in your training and experience, is it possible for someone to hold or touch an object but not leave enough of their own DNA behind to be detectable in your testing?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Were you able to conclusively say whether or not somebody touched an object?
- A. No, I cannot.
 - MR. KROUSE: Let's turn now to Timothy Smith. Can you bring up Government Exhibit 403 and go to page six please and zoom-in on the results and conclusions all the way to the bottom.
 - Q. Ms. Nelson, could you read your results and conclusions for your analysis of the DNA of Mr. Smith?
 - A. So based on the comparison in the DNA profile of the donor to the bottle submitted for Timothy Smith to the mixture found on the front, back strap and grips, he is included as a possible contributor and therefore, a likely ratio is calculated.

The results from the likelihood ratio are that the DNA mixtures found on the swab of the front, back strap and grip is approximately 134 millions times more probable if the sample originated from a donor to the bottle submitted for Timothy

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Nelson - Direct

- Smith and two unknown unrelated persons than if originated from three unknown unrelated persons. Therefore, there is very strong support that the donor to the bottle submitted for Timothy Smith and two unknown unrelated persons contributed to the mixture rather than three unknown unrelated persons.
 - Q. So the likelihood ratio in this case is 134 million times more probable, correct?
 - A. A hundred and thirty-four millions times more probable that the sample original from the DNA donor to the bottle submitted to for Smith and two unknown unrelated persons.
 - Q. Based on your testing, do you have an expert opinion about whether the DNA of Timothy Smith was on the gun that was swabbed for DNA?
 - A. He is included as a possible contributor.

MR. KROUSE: Let's move to Mr. Corbett.

Could you bring up Government Exhibit 402 and then go to page six please and then zoom-in on to the results and conclusions at the bottom.

(Pause)

- Q. What was the result of your comparison between the DNA on the gun and the DNA for Mr. Corbett?
- A. The DNA donor to the bottle submitted for Kevin Corbett matches the DNA profile from Male Donor A from the swab to the trigger/trigger guard.
- Q. Can you remind the jury who Male Donor A is from your

- 1 analysis of the gun.
- 2 A. It was the major contributor to that mixture.
- Q. And when you say that Mr. Corbett's DNA profile matches the
- 4 | Male Donor A profile, what does that mean?
- 5 A. Because we were able to determine that one person left more
- 6 of their DNA than the other, we have an actual DNA profile of
- 7 | that major contributor and the DNA profile of the major
- 8 contributor is the same as that of Kevin Corbett.
- 9 Q. You said before DNA profiles like the bar code that's left
- 10 | behind, correct?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And so Kevin Corbett's bar code matched the bar code of the
- 13 DNA profile that was on the gun?
- 14 A. Yes, the donor to the bottle submitted for him yes.
- 15 Q. And the DNA profile of Male Donor A, if you could go on and
- 16 read a statistic that's on that same results conclusions line.
- 17 A. So the DNA profile of Male Donor A is expected to be found
- 18 | in approximately one greater than 6.8 trillion people. So what
- 19 | this means is there is approximately 6.8 billion people on the
- 20 | planet earth. We would expect to find the DNA profile in one
- 21 \parallel in 1000 on the planet earth.
- 22 MR. KROUSE: Moving to the next page of this exhibit
- and zooming in on based on the comparison all the way to the
- 24 bottom.
- 25 (Pause)

2

3

4

5

20

21

22

23

25

- Q. Did you also compare Mr. Corbett's DNA profile to the swab of the front back strap and grip which is another part of the qun?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. What was the result of your analysis?
- 6 So again, this mixture was just suitable for comparison. Α. 7 So looking at the numbers in the DNA profile of the donor to the bottle submitted for Kevin Corbett and those that were 8 9 found in the mixture, he is included as a possible contributor 10 and therefore a likelihood ratio was calculated. So for that 11 likely ratio the DNA mixture found on the swab of the front, 12 back strap and grip is approximately 518 millions times more 13 probable that the sample originating from the donor to the 14 bottle submitted for Kevin Corbett and two unknown unrelated 15 persons than if this originated from three unknown unrelated Therefore, there is very strong support that the 16
- donor for the bottle submitted for Kevin Corbett and two
 unknown unrelated persons contributed to this mixture rather
 than three unknown unrelated individuals.
 - Q. So based on the results of your testing both for the trigger/trigger guard and also from, back strap and grip, do you have an opinion about whether the DNA of Kevin Corbett was on the gun that was swabbed for DNA?
- 24 | A. Yes, it was.
 - Q. And what is your opinion? Sorry.

- 1 A. That he is a contributor on the gun.
- 2 Q. Ms. Nelson, up to a point you just testified about your DNA
- 3 | testing of the gun in this case, correct?
- 4 | A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And comparing that gun to three different people, correct?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. Did you also perform tests on swabs taken from a car?
- 8 A. Yes, I did.
- 9 Q. What items did you receive to test for a car?
- 10 A. We received three swabs from the car. One was from the
- 11 steering wheel. One was from the gearshift and a third was
- 12 | from the door handle.
- 13 | O. How did the lab receive those swabs?
- 14 A. They were packaged and sealed.
- 15 Q. Who took those swabs?
- 16 A. The NYPD.
- MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, could you put on the
- 18 screen Government Exhibit 405.
- 19 (Pause)
- 20 MR. KROUSE: Could you go to page six please.
- 21 | Q. Is this the voucher for the swabs of the DNA from the car?
- 22 | A. Yes, it is.
- 23 \| 0. And what is the voucher number for this item?
- 24 | A. It is 2000455460.
- 25 | Q. Are the identifying details of the car included on this

- voucher? 1
- 2 Yes, it is. Α.

I9CAAPOL5

- 3 And what are those identifying details?
- It is a 2015 Camry with Florida license plate 122PRA. 4 Α.
- 5 And you testified to this already but where in the vehicle
- were the swabs taken? 6
- 7 A. From the steering wheel, the gearshift and the front driver's side interior door handle. 8
- 9 Q. Once your lab received the swabs from these three swabs 10 from the car, what did you do with them?
- 11 The swab from the steering wheel and the swab from the 12 gearshift were then examined for biological material. In this
- 13 case we were going -- skin cells again and they were cotton
- 14 swabs like I spoke about before. So each of the swabs were
- documented and then cut for the DNA process. 15
- You said that is for the steering wheel and the gearshift? 16
- 17 Α. Yes.
- 18 Why not the vehicle interior door that was also swabbed?
- It's a lab policy that we don't routinely do door swabs 19
- 20 when we have the steering wheel and the gearshift.
- 21 Now was each of these two swabs that were sent on for 22 testing analyzed together or were they analyzed separately?
- 23 Α. Separately.
- 24 MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, if you could move to page 25 two of this report.

- Q. Did you record, Ms. Nelson, the voucher number of the swabs that you received from the car?
 - A. Yes, I did.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

- Q. Could you read the voucher number for the swabs from the car?
- A. 2000455460.
 - MR. KROUSE: Moving to page one, Mr. Concepcion, could you zoom-in on the resulting conclusions from page one from the top to the bottom.
 - Q. What did you conclude about the swabs that you received from the car?
 - A. Human DNA sufficient for SDR DNA typing was detected on the swab from the steering wheel as well as the swab from the gearshift. For the swab from the gearshift we had detected a DNA profile from male. It was one person's DNA and that was Male Donor A.

For the swab from the steering wheel we detected a mixture of DNA and this mixture was one where an individual's contributors could not be determined. So we weren't able to tell who contributed more DNA than the other. So in this case the results were just suitable for comparison.

- Q. To be clear, your analysis of the swab of the gearshift you said you were able to defect Male Donor A, correct?
- 24 | A. Correct.
 - Q. Is that by a definition DNA profile of one person?

I9CAAPOL5

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. That's the DNA bar code that you testified to earlier,
- 3 correct?
- 4 | A. Yes.
- Q. Did there come a time when you compared the DNA from the
- 6 car to the DNA from another person?
- 7 A. Yes, I did. I just want to note that Male Donor A is a
- 8 | different Male Donor A. For each case individually we start
- 9 | with the alphabet, so we start with "A". So any unknown
- 10 profile would be Male Donor A.
- 11 | Q. Thank you for that clarification. So because this was a
- 12 different item that you're analyzing this Male Donor A isn't
- 13 | the same person as the Male Donor A on the gun, correct?
- 14 A. That's correct.
- 15 | Q. Now, did there come a time when you compared the DNA
- 16 profile from the car to a known DNA sample from another person?
- 17 | A. Yes, I did.
- 18 Q. Did that known DNA sample come from could from Polk?
- 19 A. Yes, it was.
- 20 | Q. What kind of sample was that?
- 21 | A. That was a buccal swab.
- 22 | Q. Can you explain what a buccal swab?
- 23 | A. That's where that cotton swab is placed on the inside of
- 24 | the cheek and rubbed on the inside of cheek to collect some
- 25 skin cells. That swab is then cut and sent on to the DNA

4

1 process.

- 2 Q. The DNA profile is then made for that individual who is
- 3 | swabbed, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- 5 MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you go to page 12 of 6 Government Exhibit 404.
- Q. Is there a voucher number associated with the DNA sample from Terrell Polk in your report?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | 0. What is that number?
- 11 A. 6000011470.
- 12 | Q. And did you compare this DNA sample from Mr. Polk to the
- 13 | Male Donor A DNA sample that was obtained from the gearshift of
- 14 | the vehicle?
- 15 | A. Yes, I did.
- MR. KROUSE: Mr. Concepcion, can you go to page 10 of
- 17 | this report and could you zoom-in on "results and conclusions".
- 18 Q. Ms. Nelson, if you could read in your results and
- 19 | conclusions from that analysis?
- 20 A. So the first thing that was done was we compared the DNA
- 21 profile that was taken from the swab of Terrell Polk to the DNA
- 22 | profile that we obtained from the bottle submitted for Terrell
- 23 Polk and they were the same DNA profile. The DNA profile of
- 24 | Terrell Polk then matched the DNA profile of Male Donor A from
- 25 the swab of the gearshift.

Nelson - Cross

- 1 | Q. Can you explain what that match means again?
- 2 A. So for the swab from the gearshift we had one individual's
- 3 DNA profile and the DNA profile is that of Terrell Polk.
- 4 | Q. So the two bar codes matched together, correct?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And did you calculate a statistic at the bottom?
- 7 A. Yes. The DNA profile of Male Donor A is expected to be
- 8 | found in approximately one and greater than 6.8 trillion
- 9 people. So again, there's approximately 6.8 billion people on
- 10 | the planet earth. So we would expect to see that in
- 11 | approximately one thousand planet earths.
- 12 Q. Do you have an opinion about whether the DNA on a car
- 13 | gearshift matched the DNA sample for Terrell Polk?
- 14 A. Yes, it does.
- 15 \parallel Q. What is that opinion?
- 16 A. It does match.
- 17 MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, no further questions.
- 18 THE COURT: Cross-examination?
- 19 MR. LIND: Just a few questions, judge.
- 20 THE COURT: Sure. Then we'll take a break.
- 21 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 22 BY MR. LIND:
- 23 Q. You were talking about the gun, the weapon?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. And you compared, you tested three different donors,

Nelson - Cross

- 1 | correct?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Mr. Smith, Mr. Polk and Mr. Corbett, right?
- 4 A. That's correct.
- 5 | Q. And Mr. Polk did not have his DNA on the gun?
- 6 A. He was excluded as a contributor, yes.
- 7 Q. And you mentioned in part sometimes DNA does not show up on
- 8 | various items because of its surface, correct, do you remember?
- 9 A. It's possible, yes.
- 10 Q. So the DNA of Mr. Corbett and Mr. Smith showed up on the
- 11 same item, correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. So it wasn't, you can't say with any scientific certainty
- 14 | that it was a result of, the surface of the gun was the reason
- 15 | that Mr. Polk's DNA was not on that gun, right?
- 16 A. I wouldn't be able to say that.
- 17 | Q. Now, you only got one sample to test against the gearshift
- 18 and the steering wheel, correct?
- 19 A. I'm no sure what sample --
- 20 | Q. You are talking about I think the sample in 405, the one
- 21 | from the car. DNA was tested in terms of gearshift and the
- 22 | steering wheel, correct?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. And Mr. Polk's DNA was tested against that, correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. You don't know from your testing when that DNA adhered to either of those two items, do you?
- 3 A. No, I do not.
- 4 Q. Did you test anyone else's DNA on that gearshift or
- 5 steering wheel?

9

- A. I believe the other two individuals were compared to those as well.
 - Q. And what was the result? Did not have DNA on the gearshift or steering wheel?
- 10 A. I would have to look in my files.
- 11 | Q. You can't recall?
- 12 | A. I can't recall.
- 13 MR. LIND: I have nothing further.
- 14 THE COURT: Anything further?
- MR. KROUSE: Just briefly, your Honor.
- 16 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 17 BY MR. KROUSE:
- 18 Q. Ms. Nelson, just to be clear, the DNA profile you obtained
- 19 | from the gearshift was a Male Donor A, a single person's DNA
- 20 profile, correct?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. When you compared that single person DNA profile to the DNA
- 23 profile of Mr. Polk, it was a perfect match, correct?
- 24 | A. Yes, it was.
- MR. KROUSE: No further question, your Honor.

1 MR. LIND: Nothing, your Honor. THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I am going to give 2 3 you a ten-minute break and we'll see where we are. Don't 4 discuss the case and keep an open mind. We'll be back in ten 5 minutes. 6 (Jury not present) 7 THE COURT: You can step down. What's the government's intention? Do you have another witness? 8 9 MR. KROUSE: Just one more, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: How long? 11 MR. KROUSE: It'll be a short one. It's for the 12 medical records. 13 THE COURT: So let's take a ten-minute break. We'll 14 do that witness and send the jury home. 15 (Recess) MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, before we bring the jury in, 16 17 our understanding from consulting with the defense is there is 18 no defense case. After this witness the government anticipates that it'll be done putting in its evidence but we would like an 19 20 opportunity overnight to review the transcripts to make sure 21 all of our exhibits have been properly admitted and then we 22 would anticipate in the morning if we need to bring in 23 additional exhibits. We'll do that if not then, we'll rest at 24 that point. Our understanding is the defense will rest. 25 THE COURT: That's fine. You don't have to rest this

1	afternoon. Once you finish this witness we'll adjourn for the
2	day. I usually tell the jury that if there are any further
3	witnesses, we'll hear them tomorrow morning. If there are no
4	further witnesses then we're going to move into summations.
5	MR. KROUSE: Thank you, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: So you can make a final decision.
7	Obviously, the defendant can change his mind too if he wants
8	to.
9	MR. KROUSE: Yes, your Honor.
10	On the charge conference is it our preference would
11	be to have the charge conference after the jury is dismissed
12	for the day.
13	THE COURT: We are going to do both. We're discussing
14	it after they're dismissed this afternoon and then we'll
15	discuss it again in the morning.
16	MR. KROUSE: Thank you, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: All right. Let's get the jury in.
18	(Jury present)
19	THE COURT: You can be seated, ladies and gentlemen.
20	Government calls its next witness.
21	MR. FOLLY: The government calls Jonathan Concepcion.
22	THE COURT: You can begin, Mr. Folly.
23	MR. FOLLY: Thank you, your Honor.
24	Before we proceed with questions, the government
25	offers Government Exhibit 102 which is a stipulation that was

1	previously read into the record but had not been offered as
2	evidence?
3	THE COURT: Any objection.
4	MR. LIND: No, judge.
5	THE COURT: It'll be admitted.
6	(Government's Exhibit 102 received in evidence)
7	MR. FOLLY: I would like to read into the record two
8	paragraphs from Government Exhibit 1005. We previously read
9	into the record paragraph three of that same stipulation.
10	Looking first at paragraph one:
11	The parties stipulate that on July 25, 2015, Joaquin
12	Cropper was shot in front of 1055 University Avenue in the
13	Bronx, New York. Joaquin Cropper was admitted into the Bronx
14	Lebanon Hospital on the same day, July 25, 2015, where he
15	received medical treatment for a one gunshot wound to his left
16	knee.
17	Government Exhibit 301 is a true and accurate copy of
18	business records maintained by Bronx Lebanon Hospital from
19	Joaquin Cropper's hospital visit on July 25, 2015. Government
20	Six is a true and correct photograph of Joaquin Cropper.
21	Paragraph two reads as follows:
22	On or about August 4, 2015, Ryan Jefferson was shot
23	inside of a store located at 950 Anderson Avenue in the Bronx,
24	New York. Ryan Jefferson was admitted to Lincoln Medical and

Mental Health Hospital on the same day, August 4, 2015, where

he received medical treatment for a gunshot wound to his right				
elbow. Government Exhibits 528 and 529 are true and accurate				
photographs taken on August 4, 2015 of the gunshot wound to				
Ryan Jefferson's right elbow. Government Exhibit 302 is a true				
and accurate copy of the business records maintained by Lincoln				
Medical and Mental Health Hospital from Ryan Jefferson's				
Hospitals visit on August 4, 2015.				
Your Honor, at this time we would offer into evidence				
this stipulation which is Government Exhibit 105 as well as				
Government Exhibits 301, 302 and 303, as well as Government				
Exhibits 528 and 529.				
MR. LIND: Just one moment, judge?				
THE COURT: Yes.				
(Pause)				
MR. LIND: I have no objection, judge.				
THE COURT: They'll be admitted into evidence.				
(Government's Exhibits 1005, 301 -303, 528 and 529				
received in evidence)				
MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, we also offer Government				
Exhibit 6B which is the nameplate for "Joaquin Cropper".				
MR. LIND: I have no objection.				
THE COURT: It'll be admitted into evidence.				
(Government's Exhibit 6B received in evidence)				
MR. FOLLY: Please publish for the jury Government				
Exhibit 528.				

Concepcion - Direct

1 (Pause)

2 MR. FOLLY: Can we now turn to 529. We can take that

3 done.

5

6

7

9

4 JONATHAN CONCEPCION,

called as a witness by the Government,

having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. FOLLY:

- Q. Mr. Concepcion, where do you work?
- 10 A. At the U.S. Attorney's Office in the Southern District.
- 11 | Q. How long have you worked there?
- 12 A. A little over a year.
- 13 | Q. What is your title?
- 14 A. Paralegal specialist.
- 15 | Q. What are your duties and responsibilities as a paralegal
- 16 | specialist?
- 17 | A. We help organize discovery productions. We do co-sign
- 18 | interviews. We run deliveries to chambers, tasks in that
- 19 general nature.
- 20 Q. You also help to prepare cases for trial?
- 21 | A. I do.
- 22 | Q. During the course of your duties as paralegal, did there
- 23 come a time when you began to work on this case?
- 24 A. Yes, about six weeks ago.
- 25 | Q. What type of work have you done during that time?

Concepcion - Direct

- A. I sat in on witness preparation. I've helped to organize
 3500 and the exhibits.
- 3 Q. On the witness stand beside you are Government Exhibits
- 4 | 301, 302 and 303 in that binder there. Do you recognize those
- 5 documents?
- 6 | A. Yes.

7

- Q. What type of documents are in that binder?
- 8 A. Medical records.
- 9 | Q. Let's look first at what's in evidence as Government
- 10 | Exhibit 301. Look at the top of the page. Are these the
- 11 | medical records for Joaquin Cropper?
- 12 A. Yes, they are.
- 13 | Q. Looking at the top of the page where it says "date", can
- 14 | you read that aloud?
- 15 A. 7/25/15.
- 16 | Q. Looking directly below that at the diagnosis line, can you
- 17 | read that aloud?
- 18 A. GSW femur fracture.
- 19 Q. Looking directly below that, can you read the reason for ED
- 20 | visit aloud?
- 21 A. Gunshot wound.
- 22 MR. FOLLY: Can we zoom out a little bit to the full
- 23 page.
- 24 | Q. Further down at page in the box that's titled "pain
- 25 management", can you read that aloud, pain level before

- 1 | medicine?
- 2 | A. Ten out of 10.
- MR. FOLLY: Can we publish the next page of that
- 4 exhibit and can we blow up the body diagram on the left.
- Q. Mr. Concepcion, can you read aloud the letters next to the arrows shown there next to that body diagram?
- 7 A. The top is an "H" and the bottom is "GSW".
- Q. Turning to the next page now, can you read aloud the first sentence of the "treatment plan one"?
- 10 A. Patient H/B GSW to the left knee with two holes, surgery
 11 with ortho consult, called pre-op labs.
- MR. FOLLY: You can stop there.
- Can we please go to Government Exhibit 302.
- 14 | Q. Mr. Concepcion, do you recognize this exhibit?
- 15 | A. I do.
- 16 | O. What is this?
- 17 A. Medical records for Ryan Jefferson.
- 18 | Q. Let's go to the upper right-hand corner first. What name
- 19 | is listed there?
- 20 A. Jefferson Ryan.
- 21 | Q. That's Jefferson, comma, Ryan?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Now turning to page two, can you see where there's a trauma
- 24 activation line with a check. Can you read aloud what that
- 25 says at the very top a little bit further up where the

- checkmark is on the upper portion right next to the first checkmark on the left?
- 3 \blacksquare A. The date 8/4/15.
- 4 | Q. Right next to that?
- 5 A. Tier one trauma activation.
- 6 | Q. There is a checked box next to that?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. What about the arrival time that's listed here?
- 9 | A. 12:18.
- 10 Q. Can you also read the chief complaint aloud which is listed
 11 a little further down?
- 12 A. GSW to "R" elbow.
- 13 MR. FOLLY: Let's turn now to the fifth page of these 14 records. Can you blow-up the body diagram on the right?
- Q. Mr. Concepcion, can you read aloud the letters written next to the arrow shown there with the circle?
- 17 | A. GSW.
- MR. FOLLY: Can we now publish page 12. Before we keep going with page 12, can we just go back to the fifth page for a second. Now, in the lower right-hand corner there's an identified injury location and type. Can we blow that up please.
- 23 Q. And can you read aloud the GSW entry?
- 24 MR. FOLLY: And highlight that.
- 25 A. Gunshot wound.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FOLLY: Return now to page 12. And if we could blow up the section that is titled "report" in the middle of the page, that whole large paragraph there. Q. And looking just at the report line can you go to the third sentence and read that aloud? A. Large soft tissue. Defect is seen posteriorly overlying left elbow. Q. Can you actually read the sentence before that, the third sentence? A. Metallic fragments are seen overlying medial distal humerus. MR. FOLLY: No further questions, your Honor. I have no questions, judge. MR. LIND: THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You can step down. THE WITNESS: Thank you. THE COURT: Anything further at this point this afternoon? MR. KROUSE: No, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to adjourn for the day. This is what we're going to do tomorrow. If there are any further witnesses, we'll hear them first thing tomorrow morning. If there are no further witnesses, we will go right into the summations. We'll call

closing arguments of the lawyers. I will instruct you on the

law and I will send you in to begin your deliberations.

Concepcion - Direct

What we're going to do is as soon as you arrive tomorrow we are going to take your lunch order. So if I can get you into the jury room to begin your deliberations before lunch we're just going to send your lunch right into the jury room. We'll pay for lunch tomorrow. So you just order from the menu when you first arrive.

We are going to be working here before you get here.

I'm going to ask you to be here before 9:45 so we can start

early. As I say, if there is any further evidence to be

offered we'll have it then but there's a good chance if there

is no further evidence to be offered at this point, then we

will begin with the summations tomorrow morning at 9:45 and see

if I can get the case to you for your deliberation by

lunchtime. OK?

So don't discuss the case. Keep an open mind until I finally give the case to you. I'll see you tomorrow morning at 9:45.

(Jury not present)

THE COURT: OK. Why don't you just remind me tomorrow, Mr. Lind. I'll let you make your motions after the government indicates that they are going to rest.

MR. LIND: I appreciate that, judge.

THE COURT: Then you can renew it after you rest.

I am still working on the charge. Let's start talking about it. Let's first sort of backward. If you looked at the

1	verdict sheet and do you want it in that form or do you want
2	some changes to the verdict sheet?
3	MR. NICHOLAS: Good afternoon. Feels weird to talk.
4	THE COURT: It's been a pleasure talking to you.
5	MR. NICHOLAS: Your Honor, I think we have a small
6	handful of proposed changes. It may be actually easier to work
7	backward and I don't even know if the defense will object to
8	these.
9	MR. LIND: Your Honor, I misplaced my copy. Is there
10	an extra copy?
11	THE COURT: We can print you one.
12	MR. LIND: Thank you.
13	MR. NICHOLAS: Your Honor, starting at page two on
14	Count Three, we take your Honor's, if you look at subparagraph
15	A, I think your Honor's conflating "brandished" and
16	"discharged" I think on purpose because your Honor's view is
17	probably that the evidence of brandished and discharged are
18	identical in this case.
19	(Continued on next page)
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

23

24

25

1 THE COURT: Is there some separate analysis under the facts? 2 3 MR. NICHOLAS: No, we agree with you, Judge, so we 4 would just submit that we just strike "brandish," and we'll 5 just go with discharge. I don't think there's any evidentiary 6 basis to find brandish without a discharge in this case, and I 7 think it would simplify things. I assume there's no objection to that. 8 9 THE COURT: Mr. Lind? 10 MR. LIND: That's fine with me, Judge. 11 THE COURT: All right. 12 So I will strike "brandish." 13 MR. NICHOLAS: We'll just go with discharge. 14 We've noted the pages in the Court's current draft charge -- I know the Court's still working on it -- where 15 "brandish" is mentioned, but we're fine with going with just --16 17 the only question --THE COURT: Well, it probably still fits in 18 relationship to the charge. I mean, when we're talking about 19 20 use, carry, brandish is part of that. 21 MR. NICHOLAS: There may be a very limited amount that 22 we would propose taking out.

though, with paragraph 3(a), our understanding of the law is that the actual -- the discharge itself does not have to be in

So anyway, your Honor, in connection with that,

furtherance. It's just that the gun obviously has to be carried in furtherance — carried in relation to or in furtherance, but the firing does not have to be in furtherance. So we would just suggest rephrasing paragraph (a) to say, "If you find the defendant guilty of Count Three of the indictment, was one or more firearms discharged by Terrell Polk."

THE COURT: I see.

MR. NICHOLAS: It's just a small change.

THE COURT: "If you find the defendant guilty of Count Three of the indictment, did the defendant, Terrell Polk, discharge" --

MR. NICHOLAS: "One or more firearms." "Discharge a firearm or discharge one or more firearms."

MR. LIND: And you are taking out "in furtherance"?

THE COURT: That's what you're suggesting. What's your position?

MR. NICHOLAS: Well, your Honor, we'd actually -- what might be even cleaner is we could have the question: "If you find the defendant guilty of Count Three, answer the following question: A firearm possessed or used during or in furtherance of the narcotics conspiracy was discharged," and then you could have "proven" or "not proven." I've just seen that done before.

THE COURT: Give me that language again.

MR. NICHOLAS: "A firearm possessed or used during or

```
1
      in furtherance of a narcotics conspiracy was discharged." And
      then you'd have a space for "proven" and a space for "not
 2
 3
     proven."
 4
                          I disagree with that, Judge. I think that
               MR. LIND:
5
      it doesn't give them the opportunity to just say that it was
      carried.
6
 7
               MR. NICHOLAS: Well, that's the predicate. They have
8
      to find that before they then get to this next question.
9
               MR. LIND: But I think it conflates the two, Judge. I
10
     mean, it could be just possession. Or does it have to be both
11
      under your --
12
               MR. NICHOLAS: Can I show you?
13
               MR. LIND: Yes.
14
               MR. NICHOLAS: Your Honor, I'm just showing Mr. Lind
      the...
15
               THE COURT: Why don't I just say, "Did the defendant,
16
17
      Terrell Polk, discharge that firearm?"
               MR. NICHOLAS: I think there's more than one firearm
18
19
      at issue, but I take your Honor's point that you want --
20
               THE COURT: There's more than one firearm at issue in
21
      three, also.
22
               MR. NICHOLAS: Correct, your Honor.
```

THE COURT: It just says, "carry a firearm."

MR. NICHOLAS: Right.

23

24

25

Just one moment? Let me just confer.

∥ I9CKPOL6

THE COURT: Yes. 1 2 (Pause) 3 MR. NICHOLAS: Your Honor, what we propose is a 4 compromise, which is paragraph (a) would read, "If you find the 5 defendant guilty of Count Three of the indictment, was one or more firearms" -- "was one or more of those firearms 6 7 discharged?" Or one or more of the firearms referenced in Count Three discharged or something like that. That ties it to 8 9 the narcotics conspiracy, and I just --10 THE COURT: Say it again. 11 MR. NICHOLAS: "If you find the defendant quilty of 12 Count Three of the indictment, was one or more of the firearms" --13 14 MR. LIND: Discharged. 15 THE COURT: How is that different than, did the defendant discharge a firearm? 16 17 MR. LIND: Judge, I suggest that it just be that Count 18 Three, paragraph 3, should remain the same, and that (a) should just be, "If you find the defendant guilty of Count Three, did 19 20 the defendant discharge a firearm?" 21 THE COURT: That's what you proposed originally. 22 MR. NICHOLAS: The "of firearm" just has to be linked 23 to the narcotics conspiracy. 24 THE COURT: Yes, but one or more firearms doesn't do 25 It doesn't do anything different than a firearm. That's that.

why I proposed "the firearm."

MR. LIND: The paragraph 3 already links it to the narcotics conspiracy.

THE COURT: That was your argument, paragraph 3 --

MR. LIND: It's automatically -- if they find that --

MR. NICHOLAS: We'd be fine with that, Judge.

THE COURT: Just "discharge a firearm"?

MR. NICHOLAS: That would be fine. It sounds like the defense is proposing that. We don't have an objection to it.

MR. LIND: That's amazing.

MR. NICHOLAS: Because it's a subparagraph of 3, we think it's clear.

THE COURT: Right. Look, it says the -- the first question, "How do you find defendant, Terrell Polk, with respect to the charge of using and carrying a firearm during and in relation to the narcotics conspiracy charged in Count One of the indictment?" If they check guilty, then the question is, "If you find the defendant guilty of Count Three of the indictment, did the defendant, Terrell Polk, discharge a firearm?"

MR. NICHOLAS: I think the safer thing would be "the firearm" instead of "a firearm." I know that as it were inures to the benefit of the defendant, but I think it's safer.

THE COURT: That's fine. That's what I proposed initially, "discharged the firearm."

```
MR. NICHOLAS: "Discharged the firearm."
1
               THE COURT: "The" instead of "that"?
 2
 3
               MR. NICHOLAS: Just one moment, your Honor.
 4
               "The" is fine, your Honor, with us.
 5
               MR. LIND: And then will you take out of "in
6
      furtherance of the narcotics conspiracy" in subparagraph (a)?
 7
               MR. NICHOLAS: Yes.
8
               MR. LIND: I think the government wants to take that
9
      out, right?
10
               MR. NICHOLAS: Yes. That was the change.
11
               MR. LIND: I don't object to that, Judge.
12
               MR. NICHOLAS: So, to be clear, paragraph (a) would
13
      read, "If you find the defendant quilty of Count Three of the
14
      indictment, did the defendant, Terrell Polk, discharge the
      firearm?"
15
16
               THE COURT: All right.
17
               MR. NICHOLAS: And then, Judge, moving just up one
      level, to paragraph 3, we would just propose adding -- this is
18
      before you get to (a), currently it reads, "How do you find the
19
20
      defendant, Terrell Polk, with respect to the charge of using
21
      and carrying a firearm during and in relation to the narcotics
22
      conspiracy?" The Court's proposed charge, we think, correctly
23
      also includes the option of possessing a firearm in furtherance
24
      of the conspiracy, so we think that the question in Count Three
```

should be "with respect to the charge of using and carrying a

firearm during and in relation to the narcotics conspiracy, or possessing a firearm in furtherance of that conspiracy, charged in Count One of the indictment."

THE COURT: That seems to complicate it a little more than -- I don't know if you want to complicate it. I don't see how you can use or carry a firearm and not possess it. How can you discharge it without possessing it?

THE MARSHAL: Your Honor, I agree with that. The question, though, is whether they could — theoretically, the jury could find, okay, he possessed — let's say that for some reason, the jury decides that we don't find that the defendant fired the shots in the video, but based on his prison calls where he's referring to — he's telling somebody, did you take the basketball out of the safe, we do think he possessed a firearm. He wouldn't have necessarily used or carried —

THE COURT: I think you probably shouldn't have tried this case if that's -- because there would be no real theory to look at this evidence and a reasonable jury could conclude that.

MR. LIND: I don't understand what he's doing. I don't know what he's talking about. The one in the safe has nothing --

THE COURT: What it really comes down to is what you are reasonably going to argue to this jury. So tell me what you're reasonably going to argue to this jury. What's the

crime that you want them to convict him on?

If the crime that you want them to convict him of is the gun that you say he was seen on the camera firing at somebody or the shotgun that you claim that the evidence indicates that he blew through the door, then -- which makes sense, then that's not much of a danger. I don't know what other possession you think that Count Three -- you're going to argue that Count Three is relying upon a gun that they hadn't seen or the gun in the car.

MR. NICHOLAS: Well, there was testimony from the cooperating witness that everybody in the conspiracy possessed guns because they needed those as kind of tools of the trade.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. NICHOLAS: And there were prison calls where the defendant is on tape talking about having a gun in his safe.

MR. LIND: But, Judge, they didn't find one there. I don't understand how -- that gets very confusing.

MR. NICHOLAS: That goes to the weight, though,
Mr. Lind. We understand --

THE COURT: You want to argue to the jury that there's some unknown gun that you haven't found that he's being charged with?

MR. NICHOLAS: We just want to have the option of saying to the jury -- I'm not giving the closing, but in sum and substance, look, it's on tape, but, in addition, you also

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

know from the prison calls that he possessed --

THE COURT: Well, let me think about it.

MR. NICHOLAS: Okay.

THE COURT: I'll tell you what I'm trying to avoid is I'm trying to avoid any argument that one could believe that the jury didn't unanimously find the facts. And if you give them too many choices, then I need to know what choices they're unanimously making. If you want to make some theory that there's some gun that they haven't seen that you say is this crime, I'm not going to let a third of the jury find beyond a reasonable doubt there was such a qun, a third of the jury find beyond a reasonable doubt that it was one of the guns that they possessed, and a third of the jury decide that it's the gun in the car. You've got to focus this jury. You've got to be confident in your case and focus this case. This is not about The jury is going to be -- I don't think that's a phantom gun. even a credible argument to make to this jury.

And I don't know what evidence there is that -there's clearly no evidence that he used another gun. Maybe
you're right, maybe there's some evidence that maybe they
had -- but I'm not sure what gun you're talking about. What
gun are you talking about?

MR. NICHOLAS: Well, your Honor, first of all, I don't disagree at all about the primary thrust of the case. I totally agree with the Court on that. I think it's just a

matter of	preservin	g the opt	ion for th	ne jury.	We're o	bviously
confident	in the cas	se, but w	e don't wa	ant to jus	st give	up
another o	ption that	we think	would be	available	e to the	m if

THE COURT: I know, but the other problem I have with this is that it creates a different problem with question (a) because question (a) -- you can't apply question (a) to that. Some gun that he possessed in the safe? There's absolutely no evidence that he discharged such a gun, so you can't ask the question that way. You can't have the jury say, we don't believe he fired the shotgun, we don't believe he fired the pistol on tape, but we believe he may have had a gun in the safe, and then have the jury say to you that he discharged the firearm.

MR. NICHOLAS: I think if they only found that -- if for some reason they concluded that he didn't discharge the guns on the tape, but he did have one in the safe, we agree with the Court --

THE COURT: They would say no.

MR. NICHOLAS: -- they would just answer no to question (a), and that's okay.

MR. LIND: But, Judge, there was no gun in the safe. He's talking about a gun in the safe. They go to his place, they look in the safe, there's no gun there. I think it's a terrific appellate argument, and really --

MR. NICHOLAS: That search was a year and a half

1 later, Judge.

MR. LIND: So how do they know that there was a gun in the safe? Because he's talking about it?

MR. FOLLY: He said --

MR. LIND: He could have --

MR. NICHOLAS: With respect, your Honor, he says -- on a prison call, he asks somebody if his gun is still in the safe. I recognize he uses a code word, but we would argue that's very compelling evidence.

THE COURT: Well, then, you're going to have to add "in furtherance of a crime" to that language because that is required, "to possess a gun in furtherance of the crime."

MR. NICHOLAS: That's paragraph 3, but not (a). (a) is just the discharge.

THE COURT: But it's not in 3. You're going to have to add it.

MR. NICHOLAS: Oh, paragraph 3, we would add it,

Judge. You're absolutely right, we would -- the language we
would add to just 3 is "and in relation to the narcotics
conspiracy charged in Count One, or possessed a firearm in
furtherance of that conspiracy."

THE COURT: I have to tip in Mr. Lind's favor on this one. If you want possession, I cannot ask the jury whether or

not that gun was discharged, because there's absolutely no evidence in this case that some phantom gun that was in the safe was discharged. I can't ask them that because if they come back with a verdict, I can't explain which gun they're talking about.

So you've got to figure out how complicated you want this to be.

MR. NICHOLAS: So, your Honor, the Court's point is well taken. We may, in the morning, come back with some proposed language for the -- that accommodates the Court's concern. One thing that it could do is in paragraph (a), paragraph (a) would say, "If you find the defendant guilty of Count Three of the indictment, did the defendant, Terrell Polk, discharge a firearm that he carried during and in" -- "that he used and carried during and in relation to the narcotics conspiracy." That would solve it. I take the Court's point that it makes it a little more complicated.

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ LIND}$: There's absolutely no evidence that he did that, Judge.

THE COURT: Did what?

MR. LIND: With regard to the firearm in the safe, there's absolutely --

THE COURT: No, he's not talking about the firearm in the safe.

MR. LIND: Okay.

MR. NICHOLAS: So, your Honor, that's one possibility.

It makes it a little more complicated. That's a risk that

we --

MR. LIND: Judge, I am going to object to anything regarding a firearm -- a nonexistent firearm in the safe. The fact that he's talking about it --

MR. NICHOLAS: We can certainly argue to the jury that he possessed firearms, and that that prison call indicates that. If Mr. Lind wants to say, ladies and gentlemen, it's just words, then that's -- he can argue that.

MR. LIND: And they go --

THE COURT: Look, you can argue whatever you think is consistent with the evidence, but it seems to me that the jury — unless you say it to the jury, the jury is not thinking that this charge has anything to do with a gun that's in the safe. That's not in their mind. That is only going to be placed in their mind if you say it. And if you say it, quite frankly, my opinion is you're weakening the case, not strengthening the case because that's not what the jury is thinking about, and they're going to wonder why you're talking about some phantom gun when you claim that he shot two people in the street.

MR. NICHOLAS: The Court's point is well taken. We'll sleep on it, and if there's -- if we do want to propose integrating the possession language into paragraph 3, we'll

propose specific language first thing in the morning. We'll sleep on it given the Court's points.

THE COURT: Look, I think that there is -- I think that both the gun in the car and the gun -- and the reference to a gun possibly being in the safe is evidence that these individuals used and carried firearms. I think that's further evidence of that, and that buttresses any claim that the guns that were on the video or the shootings that were on the video weren't -- that they weren't using and carrying guns. But I don't think that there is any way that I can tell the jury that they have a possibility to determine that there was either a gun in the safe that was discharged or the gun in the car was discharged.

MR. NICHOLAS: We don't disagree with that. And -
THE COURT: Unless you exclude those possibilities and
then try to --

MR. NICHOLAS: If we proposed language -- the Court's point is very well taken. We'll sleep on it.

If we do propose adding the possession language to paragraph 3, then we will add language to (a) that makes it clear that the discharge language only applies to what was used and carried. But let us sleep on it, your Honor. The Court's point is well taken.

THE COURT: All right.

I think I have a pretty good idea of how this case is

before this jury. The charges here -- for example, he's not even formally charged with a particular weapon on a particular day.

MR. NICHOLAS: Correct. Though I think that may militate in favor of the integrating possession, but all the Court's points are very well taken. We'll stick for now with the amendment to paragraph (a), and we'll sleep on -- so, your Honor --

THE COURT: On the jury form?

MR. NICHOLAS: The only other suggestion we have for the jury is: In Count One, as the Court notes in paragraph 1, one of the objects of the conspiracy was marijuana. We just wanted to make sure that paragraph (a), subparagraph (a), accommodates for the possibility for the jury to find the marijuana object and not the crack object. That's important because under 21, U.S.C., 841, it's a (b)(1)(D) charge, which would carry different implications.

THE COURT: Right. Well, not the marijuana, the marijuana doesn't.

MR. NICHOLAS: I'm sorry?

THE COURT: The crack cocaine does.

MR. NICHOLAS: The crack cocaine -- only the marijuana would apply to (b)(1)(D), so we want --

THE COURT: That's not going to enhance the penalty.

MR. NICHOLAS: Agreed, but it would lower it. So, for

example, theoretically, the jury could say, okay, this conspiracy involved marijuana but we don't know if it involved crack. So they could find guilty on paragraph 1, then go to paragraph (a) and say where is the option for marijuana. I'm not saying that's what we think is likely. I'm --

THE COURT: How a jury could do that when you went to his house and you found packaged crack cocaine --

MR. NICHOLAS: Your Honor, all we would ask, for now -- again, I take the Court's points -- we would just propose --

THE COURT: You want to drop marijuana altogether?

MR. NICHOLAS: No, we don't want to do that, your Honor, but what we might do is, as we think about paragraph 3, the same way we'll think about whether to propose an extra box for paragraph 1(a) -- and maybe we will, maybe we won't, and if we do, it will be for the Court's consideration in the morning. But we just wanted to flag that for the Court.

THE COURT: See, that's the only other thing, because, appropriately, you only charged him in Count Two with possession of crack cocaine. The crack cocaine was seized from his apartment.

MR. NICHOLAS: Correct, your Honor. But the evidence showed that part of the conspiracy was to sell marijuana and, obviously, he protected another member of the conspiracy, who had a conflict over turf for marijuana.

THE COURT: So what do you want to argue to the jury?

MR. NICHOLAS: Your Honor, I don't want to speak to

that because I'm not giving the summation, and it's premature.

I just wanted to reserve the right, if we may propose an

additional box in paragraph (a), and if we do, we'll bring it

the Court's attention first thing in the morning.

THE COURT: As you see, one of the ways I analyze is this is, I try to figure out what it is that you're reasonably going to argue to this jury based on these facts. I don't think you're reasonably going to argue to this jury, based on these facts, that he was somehow involved only in the marijuana conspiracy.

THE MARSHAL: We will not be arguing that the defendant was only involved in marijuana.

THE COURT: Or that any view of this evidence could lead a reasonable jury conclude that.

MR. NICHOLAS: I agree with your Honor on that. We would just respectfully ask to reserve the right to add a box -- to propose an additional line on that.

THE COURT: Look, I've thought about a lot of these issues already, but that's why I fashioned it this way.

Think about: Why isn't that addressed by (a)?

MR. NICHOLAS: Is the Court's point that if they

answer guilty to paragraph 1, and then didn't check any box in

(a), then we could all assume that, okay, they found that he

```
participated in the conspiracy but he only did marijuana?
1
 2
               THE COURT: No, would I never say that. I don't think
 3
      any reasonable jury could conclude that on these facts.
 4
               MR. NICHOLAS: Okay.
 5
               THE COURT: I don't think any unreasonable jury could
      conclude that on these facts. You said the guy had crack
6
 7
      cocaine in his apartment. Is there anyplace that he personally
8
     had marijuana?
9
               MR. NICHOLAS: No.
                                   The Court's point is well taken.
10
     All I'm proposing is just, I just wanted to flag --
11
               THE COURT: Mr. Lind?
                          I'm sorry, Judge?
12
               MR. LIND:
13
               THE COURT: You want do it the way they want to do it?
14
               MR. LIND: No, I don't.
               THE COURT: All right. Let's think about it. And you
15
16
      can come back to me tomorrow.
17
               MR. NICHOLAS: We'll think about it, your Honor, and
18
      the Court's point is well taken.
19
               Did the Court want to move on to the charge now?
20
               THE COURT: Yes.
21
               MR. NICHOLAS: Okay.
22
               THE COURT: I usually split it up in halves, the first
23
      half of the general instruction, basically between 1 to page
24
          Is there anything, before we get to the substantive
```

construction, where you wanted to modify the language, add

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 something, an instruction?

MR. LIND: Judge, I never reviewed this at all. May I have a few minutes to review this? I haven't reviewed it all.

THE COURT: Sure, sure. We're going to talk about it again tomorrow morning. You don't have to argue it now. Just flag it for me if you know some things that you want me to concentrate on now.

The government has some things already?

MR. NICHOLAS: We do, your Honor. I'm sorry --

THE COURT: That's all right.

THE MARSHAL: -- to burden the Court.

THE COURT: I sit here every day --

MR. NICHOLAS: So, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- whether you're here or not.

MR. NICHOLAS: Your Honor, on page 35, the Court has a sentence in the middle -- this is the section on cooperating witnesses, and the Court writes: "A witness who realizes that he or she may be able to obtain their own freedom or receive a lighter sentence by giving testimony favorable to the U.S. Attorney has a motive to testify falsely."

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. NICHOLAS: Your Honor, respectfully, we would submit that that's argument. Mr. Lind can certainly say that.

THE COURT: I think that's the standard language out of Sand's charge. I didn't make that up.

MR. NICHOLAS: No, I know, I'm sure -- I assume the Court has used it before. I don't recall seeing it in trials I've done. I could be wrong. I didn't compare this to another -- I just read this, frankly, while the testimony was going on, so I haven't compared it. I would just ask for the chance to review some other charges and check that, because on its face, to me, it sounds like that's what Mr. Lind will say, but, actually, the motive is to tell the truth because that's how he gets the 5K.

MR. LIND: Then I guess it must be struck from the charge.

THE COURT: Say it again.

MR. LIND: If I agree with it but they don't, I guess we should eliminate it.

THE COURT: The whole -- oh, you mean the witness?

MR. LIND: The witness.

THE COURT: Well, let's put it this way: Look and see if either Mr. Lind agrees with you or it's not in the standard Sand charge, I will drop it.

MR. NICHOLAS: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: If it's in the standard Sand charge and Mr. Lind wants to keep it in, then I'll keep it in.

MR. NICHOLAS: Understood. I am assuming Mr. Lind is going to want to keep it in, so I will check Sand when I get back to the office.

THE COURT: I'm pretty sure I have used it in the past, and I think I've taken it straight out of the language of Sand.

MR. NICHOLAS: So, your Honor, the only other one we had before page 50 or so was on page 44. The Court has the standard instruction for specific investigation techniques not required. I don't know that --

THE COURT: You don't want it? I can take it out.

MR. NICHOLAS: Mr. Lind hasn't argued that now. We would propose it just be in brackets. If Mr. Lind argues it in closing, we would ask for it, but if he doesn't, it may just add an issue that's --

MR. LIND: I don't think I will, Judge, but if I don't, then --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. NICHOLAS: Maybe for now, we can just put it in brackets.

THE COURT: Usually it's the government that wants this, not the defense.

MR. NICHOLAS: Right. And if he argues it, we'll ask that it be reinstated, but if he doesn't make an argument he hasn't made yet, I think we don't need it.

THE COURT: Okay.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ NICHOLAS: That was all for the general stuff, your Honor.

THE COURT: I had some corrections already in the general stuff. I will drop that unless you tell me to put it back.

On page 56, all of that is repetitive, after the first sentence. All of that has been said before. I'm just dropping the rest of that page, that the indictment is not evidence. I think if you go back to page -- I forget which page, a previous page is where all of that is.

So on that page, it's just going to say, "With these preliminary instructions in mind, let us turn to the charges against the defendant as contained in the indictment," and I will drop the rest.

MR. LIND: But, Judge, I would request that the next sentence, "I remind you that an indictment itself is not evidence" --

THE COURT: All I'm saying is, I already have that in there. Let me go back. It's already in here on another page.

MR. LIND: Okay.

of not guilty, the burden is on the prosecution to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden never shifts to the defendant for the simple reason that the law" -- no, "although the defendant has been indicted, you must remember that an indictment is only an accusation; it is not evidence. The defendant has pled not guilty to that indictment. Also, the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

fact that the defendant was arrested and held in federal custody is not evidence of his guilt."

That's the same thing on page --

MR. LIND: All right.

THE COURT: -- 56 that says, "I remind you that an indictment is not evidence. It merely describes the charges against the defendant. It's an accusation. It may not be considered by you as evidence of the defendant's guilt. Also, the fact the defendant was arrested or held in custody is not to be considered by you as evidence of his guilt."

And then: "Reaching your determination of whether the government has proved the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, you may consider only the evidence introduced or lack of evidence," all that language is already in there.

MR. LIND: Okay.

THE COURT: I'm going to drop it.

Okay. Let's go further to the substantive. There are some corrections that I'm making already.

If you go to page 64, the next to last line, the last word on the next to last line says "firearm." I'm going to change that word to "item."

Same thing on the next page --

MR. LIND: I'm sorry, Judge, what page? 64?

THE COURT: 64, yes. The last word of the next to

25 last sentence.

1 MR. LIND: That is --THE COURT: It says "firearm." I'm changing that to 2 3 "item." So they can apply to both drugs and guns. 4 The next page, the same thing, where it says "firearm" 5 in the second line, I'm changing that to "item." I'll go 6 through it and make sure I don't miss something. 7 In the next paragraph, in the third line, it says, "having physical custody or control of an object." I'm going 8 9 to change that word to "item," because I don't want to confuse 10 it with the object of the conspiracy. I don't want to use 11 those words for two different meanings. 12 Same thing on the third line from the bottom, "control 13 over an object," it says, it will say "control over an item." 14 MR. LIND: Where was -- I see, Judge. 15 THE COURT: I'm changing it to "item," both, those two pages where it says "firearm" and where it says "object." As a 16 17 matter of fact, I see another one I just missed. MR. LIND: Another object? I see one. 18 THE COURT: Yes, four before the bottom, fourth or 19 20 fifth line. I will read through it. 21 MR. LIND: There's one three lines from the bottom 22 also, Judge. 23 THE COURT: Three from the bottom? 24 MR. NICHOLAS: And I think the Court probably already 25 caught --

```
1
               THE COURT: Yes, I have.
 2
               MR. NICHOLAS: -- page 66.
 3
               THE COURT: Page 66?
 4
               MR. NICHOLAS: Also, it has I think there's some
 5
      references to firearms.
6
               THE COURT: Okay. Yes, I see three.
 7
               MR. NICHOLAS: And then the next paragraph, Judge,
      that starts with, "To satisfy this element," I think also
8
9
      contains mention of firearms.
10
               I think the paragraph that starts with, "To satisfy
11
      this element," it may be that that paragraph is meant to be
12
      somewhere else and was put here.
13
               THE COURT: Yes, I agree.
14
               MR. NICHOLAS: It may be a cut-and-paste thing.
15
               THE COURT: Yes.
               MR. LIND: Then, in the next sentence there, Judge, on
16
17
     page 66, four lines from the bottom, also it says "firearm."
18
               THE COURT: Yes. I see two in that paragraph.
               MR. LIND: Then there's another one --
19
20
               THE COURT: It says "weapon." Wait a minute. Is this
21
      in the firearm section?
22
               Yes, we changed this position. I'll have to change
23
      that last paragraph on 66.
24
               All right. I'm going to move the sentence to the
25
      firearms section. "It also means that he knew that the weapon
```

```
was a firearm" -- I don't even know why I need that. Is there
1
      any reason I need that language at all?
 2
 3
               MR. NICHOLAS: I'm sorry, your Honor, which?
               THE COURT: "It also means that he knew that the
 4
 5
      weapon was a firearm."
6
               MR. LIND: Where is this, Judge? What page?
 7
               THE COURT: That's at the bottom of that same page.
               MR. NICHOLAS: That one I do remember from -- I would
8
9
      keep it -- I think it's in every charge -- but it's up to the
10
      Court.
11
               THE COURT: If you want it, I'll keep it, but I'll
12
      just move it to the firearms section.
13
               MR. NICHOLAS: Yes, agree with that.
14
               THE COURT: But that's not an issue here for the jury.
               And you had some other stuff that you wanted to
15
      identify for me now?
16
17
               MR. NICHOLAS: Just a small handful of others, Judge.
18
               On page 71, in the paragraph starting "Moreover," the
19
      second sentence in that paragraph is, "Furthermore, the
20
      defendant need not have joined in all of the conspiracy's
21
      unlawful objectives, " we would propose adding: "or have been a
22
     member of the conspiracy for the entire duration of its
23
      existence."
24
               I'm just not sure that's stated that explicitly
25
      anywhere. I think --
```

1 THE COURT: I thought that was in --MR. NICHOLAS: I think the Court does have language 2 3 about -- the Court does use the word "duration" at one point, 4 but I just think it would be clearer. 5 THE COURT: Where are you? 6 MR. NICHOLAS: I'm on 71, end of the first paragraph, 7 "Furthermore, the defendant need not have joined in all of the conspiracy's unlawful objectives." We propose adding there, 8 9 comma, "or have been a member of the conspiracy for the entire duration of its existence." 10 11 THE COURT: I see. 12 What's the specific language? Where is it that you 13 want --14 MR. NICHOLAS: Your Honor, it was at page 71. THE COURT: Where are you lifting that language from? 15 Did you have that in one of your charges? 16 17 MR. NICHOLAS: No. That's an original, but I think it's definitely the law, and I just thought it would be 18 19 clear --20 THE COURT: What's the language you want? 21 MR. NICHOLAS: Let me just go back to the page, to get 22 it right. Your Honor, it was at the end of the sentence that 23 starts, "Furthermore." So after the words "unlawful 24 objectives, "we would propose, comma, "or have been a member of 25

the conspiracy for the entire duration of its existence."

THE COURT: "Nor have been a member of the conspiracy for its entire duration"?

MR. NICHOLAS: Right. So the full sentence would read: "Furthermore, the defendant need not have joined in all of the conspiracy's unlawful objectives, nor have" -- yes, your Honor -- "nor have been a member of the conspiracy for the entire duration of its existence" or "for its entire duration" may be easier. "For its entire duration" is fine.

THE COURT: All right.

Anything else?

MR. NICHOLAS: No, your Honor. Only that the language as to brandishing starts at page 96. So we would just right now, at the bottom of that page, for example, there's a paragraph on defining brandishing, meaning displaying the full thing. We wouldn't want that because it would confuse the issue.

THE COURT: So what do you want out?

MR. NICHOLAS: Page 96, just the references to "brandished," if we can just have it as discharged, we're happy to drop "brandished" from the verdict form.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ LIND: So we should also drop it from the second paragraph, I think.

MR. NICHOLAS: That's fine with us. We're fine dropping the word "brandish."

THE COURT: So you just want to use "discharge"?

MR. NICHOLAS: Yes, your Honor. For the reasons the Court has articulated about the nature of the proof, we think it's simpler.

MR. LIND: And the title, I guess, Count Three, Judge?

THE COURT: I don't read the titles.

MR. LIND: Okay. The jury doesn't get a copy of the charge?

THE COURT: Only if you tell me to send it in. I usually do not. I don't want to waste their time with it unless they need it, but if they ask for it to be sent in, I will sanitize it without the titles --

MR. LIND: Okay.

THE COURT: -- and send it in without the title.

MR. LIND: Very good.

THE COURT: So "The jury must be unanimous as to whether the firearm was discharged." Are you going to read to them the indictment? Is that your intention at this point? Or are you just going to summarize the charge?

MR. NICHOLAS: Mr. Folly is doing the closing, but he's certainly not going to -- I don't think he's going to explicate the indictment. I think he does intend to tell the jury what he anticipates the Court will tell the jurors what the elements are of each charge. So his closing is rooted in something, but he's not going to read the indictment.

MR. LIND: Judge, I just noticed on page 101 -- I'm

```
sorry if I'm interrupting -- about the prior felony conviction. I think there should be some language to the effect -- I recall this in some other case, where the fact that he has a prior felony conviction should not be held against him, something to that effect. I mean, it's just there because it's an element of the offense.
```

THE COURT: No, I understand that. I thought it was in there. I may have dropped it when I was dropping some other portions. What page are you looking at?

MR. LIND: 101.

THE COURT: All right. Let me look. I did have some language. I'll look and see if I can get some language.

If you find some language that you prefer, let me know tomorrow. Otherwise, I'll look for something.

MR. LIND: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. So I'll work on those.

Anything else we can discuss now, or we can discuss the rest in the morning?

MR. LIND: Yes.

MR. NICHOLAS: No.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's good. I'll see you at 9:30. We'll finalize this at 9:45. Hopefully, before 10:00 o'clock we can start summation.

MR. KROUSE: Thank you, your Honor.

(212) 805-0300

```
THE COURT: All right. See you.
 1
                (Adjourned to September 13, 2018 at 9:30 a.m.)
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION
2	Examination of: Page
3	CICERO WILLIAMS
4	Direct By Mr. Lind 390
5	Redirect By Mr. Krouse 433
6	Recross By Mr. Lind 438
7	CLARESSA PRIOR
8	Direct By Mr. Folly 441
9	Cross By Mr. Lind 451
10	SCOTT PATTERSON
11	Direct By Mr. Folly 452
12	KEGHAM JARJOKIAN
13	Direct By Mr. Krouse 457
14	JONATHAN FOX
15	Direct By Mr. Folly 491
16	Cross By Mr. Lind 503
17	HEATHER NELSON
18	Direct By Mr. Krouse 511
19	Cross By Mr. Lind 548
20	Redirect By Mr. Krouse 550
21	JONATHAN CONCEPCION
22	Direct By Mr. Folly 555
23	GOVERNMENT EXHIBITS
24	Exhibit No. Received
25	103 AND 1000 449

l	
1	103-A
2	511 and 512 454
3	1003 and 7B
4	501 - 510
5	104
6	539 471
7	1007
8	1006
9	102-A, 102-B, and 102-С 489
10	533
11	513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, and 519 490
12	1004
13	401 - 405
14	102
15	1005, 301 -303, 528 and 529 554
16	6B
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
ļ	